

H E L P E R ' S

4

IMPENDING CRISIS

DISSECTED.

BY

SAML. M. WOLFE,
VIRGINIA.

"He hears
On all sides, from innumerable tongues,
A dismal, universal hiss, the sound
Of public scorn."

Milton's Paradise Lost.

NEW YORK:
J. T. LLOYD, Ag.
1860.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1860, by

J. T. LLOYD,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, in and for the
Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

DEDICATION.

TO

HON'S THOS. S. BOCOCK AND R. M. T. HUNTER,
OF VIRGINIA,

HON. JOHN COCHRANE, OF NEW YORK,

HON. JOHN D. ASHMORE, OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

HON. CHARLES H. LARRABEE, OF WISCONSIN,

HON. JABEZ L. M. CURRY, OF ALABAMA,

HON. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS,

HON. JOHN B. CLARK, OF MISSOURI,

HON. PHILIP B. FOUKE, OF ILLINOIS,

HON. JOHN McRAE, OF MISSISSIPPI,

AND

TO ALL PATRIOTS NORTH AND SOUTH,

IN THEIR ENDEAVORS TO ENSURE THE SUCCESSFUL DEFEAT OF

HELPERISM AND SHERMANISM,

And who love truth better than falsehood, who desire to see the
Constitution of our fathers preserved inviolate of the spirit of
Harmony that brought it into being, and who desire to see
the hellish doctrines of Republicanism crushed to pieces,

THIS WORK IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED,

BY THEIR

FRIEND AND FELLOW-CITIZEN,

THE AUTHOR.

P R E F A C E.

AFTER the first appearance of Helper's "Impending Crisis of the South," the Author of this work intended to have answered it immediately; but on considering it, he thought that it was too contemptible to notice, and he determined to pay no attention to it whatsoever, and would have adhered to his resolution had the work not had so much importance given to it by Members of Congress during the late contest for Speakership of the House of Representatives. But as the work has been brought to the attention of the public by Members of Congress, we think some notice may be taken of the *many* lies contained in the work of this vile wretch (Helper). And in refuting his would-be arguments, and by correcting his Statistics, and calling the attention of the public to the incendiary portions of his infamous work, we will not allow ourselves, like Helper, to descend so much beneath the dignity of humanity,

much less of a gentleman, be that humanity ever so corrupt, as to notice some of the obscure and disgusting insinuations, leaving these, as we do, for the public to consider them as the effusions of a diseased brain,—as Mr. Helper's must have been, or he never would have stooped so low as to make the dirty allusions to those who *honestly* differed with him. And it appears worse when we consider that not more than three years ago, this very same man held the opinion that Slavery *was right* and *ought* to be extended, as we show on Page 67 of our work; but who seeing he could make nothing further out of the South, went to the North and turned against us, and now (*not honestly* we believe) denounces what he once considered *right* as being *wrong*. We leave it to the public to judge what confidence can be placed in such a man. We have not followed Helper in a regular manner in considering his Statistics, but have met them all at one time. Believing, as we do, that we here discharge a high duty not only to truth, but to our country, we put forth the following pages for the consideration of the citizens of the United States.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
The Black Republican Party a Disunion Party—The Unanswerable Proofs—Their Open Hostility to the South—The Fanatics of the North urging on a "Crisis" that will rebound on the heads of the Freemen of the North, and bring down Labor in the North to Starvation Prices!—The Ball set in motion—Strike of Six Thousand Mechanics in Massachusetts—First Fruits of Republicanism.....	7

CHAPTER II.

Statistical Fallacies of Helper's Book—The True State of the Case—Large Balance in favor of the South—The boasted Free Labor of the North overshadowed by the Productions of the South—Report of the Secretary of the United States' Treasury—The Republican Party trying to Dissolve the Union of the States—The South in favor of Perpetuating the Union of these States as long as their rights are respected—Republican Party a Sectional Party—The Proofs from Northern Men.....	38
---	----

CHAPTER III.

Helper's Slanders on the Non-Slaveholding people of the South refuted—Better chance in the South for a poor man than in the North—The proofs—Names of prominent statesmen of the	(3)
--	-----

South who have risen from poverty to the highest eminence—The Negro well treated in the South—Richly repaid for his Labor—Comparisons between the poor Whites of the North and the Negro of the South—The Strike of the poor Whites in Massachusetts—They admit that they are worse off than the Slaves in the South.....

57

CHAPTER IV.

The Hypocrisy of Helper—In favor of Slavery in his work issued 1855—Driven from the South for stealing three hundred dollars—Writes "Helper's Impending Crisis of the South"—Helper denounces free negroes in his "Land of Gold"—Valuable statistical information in regard to the power and wealth of the South—Seaports of the South—Shore line of States on the Atlantic Ocean in favor of the South, of eighteen thousand miles more than the North—The power of the South to establish and maintain a separate and independent government against the United North combined—The military strength of the South estimated at six million whites—Her immense resources in case of war.....

66

CHAPTER V.

Helper's ignorance of the feelings of the non-slaveholding population of the South to their country—The negroes of the South true to their masters—The proofs given at Harper's Ferry—Not a slave attempted to run away—The South have no fears of the uprising of the negroes—How the negroes aided their masters to repel the British under Lord Cornwallis, and at New Orleans—Report of the Virginia Legislature on the Harper's Ferry outrage.....

76

CHAPTER VI.

Helper's Book Ruining the Trade of the North—Trade Crushed—The Bankruptcy of the entire North predicted—Helper's

Advice to the North adopted by the entire South—Republican Party responsible for the Withdrawal of the Southern Trade—"The Shoe commences to Pinch"—Helper's Statistics of the Prices of Land in the South demolished.....	126
--	-----

CHAPTER VII.

The Declaration of Independence quoted to prove the Negro was not Born, "Created Free and Equal," with the White Man—Judge Taney's Decision in the Dred Scott Case quoted to prove the Author's assertions.....	153
---	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

Northern Testimony in regard to the Aggressions of the Republican Party against the South—Extracts from the Speeches of the Hon. J. A. Logan and Stephen A. Douglas—The Damage inflicted upon the Northern Merchants and Manufacturers by the Republican Party—The Proofs—The South in favor of Disunion in certain Contingencies—Eloquent Defense of the South, by Hon. Horatio G. Seymour of New York, and Col. J. W. Wall of New Jersey.....	162
---	-----

CHAPTER IX.

Speech of the Hon. L. Q. C. Lamar, of Mississippi, on the Excitement of the times—His noble defense of Slavery—Civil War in the United States predicted years ago by Commodore Decatur, of the United States Navy—Slavery proven to have existed in the Hebrew Nation—Lord Macaulay, the author, quoted to show the vast ruin it would entail upon thousands of the whites in England, were Slavery abolished in the United States—The great blessings of the Cotton Crop..	179
---	-----

CHAPTER X.

Helper's Quotations from the Bible annihilated—Slavery not denounced by the Bible—The Proofs of Slavery as it existed	
---	--

before Christ—Southern Slavery Beneficial both to the Slave and his Master—The Bible endorses Slavery : hence the cry of the Republicans, “ We must have an Anti-slavery Bible, an Anti-slavery Constitution, and an Anti-slaver, God !”.....	PAGE 204
--	-------------

CHAPTER XI.

Our Views on Slavery—The Negro as he is, incompetent to do for Himself—The Proofs—Conclusion.....	213
--	-----

HELPER'S IMPENDING CRISIS DISSECTED.

CHAPTER I.

The Black Republican Party a Disunion Party—The Unanswerable Proofs—Their Open Hostility to the South—The Fanatics of the North urging on a "Crisis" that will rebound on the heads of the Freemen of the North, and bring down Labor in the North to Starvation Prices!—The Ball set in motion—Strike of Six Thousand Mechanics in Massachusetts—First Fruits of Republicanism

"Judge me not ungentle,
Of manner rude, and insolent of speech,
If, when the public safety is in question,
My zeal flows warm and eager from my tongue."

IN 1859, a man destitute of principle, driven from a State of which he claims to be a native on account of his rascality, published a book at the instance of the "Publishing Committee" of the *Black* Republican Party, to be used as a campaign document, entitled "The Impending Crisis of the South; by Hinton Rowan Helper, of North Carolina."

This book, advocating treason, rebellion, civil war, insurrection, murder, arson, rapine and bloodshed, received the signatures of the following Members of Congress, recommending its circulation, etc.:—

Schuyler Colfax,
Anson Burlingame,
Owen Lovejoy,
Amos P. Granger,
Edwin B. Morgan,
Galusha A. Grow,
Joshua R. Giddings,
Edward Wade,
Calvin C. Chaffee,
Abraham B. Olin,
Emory B. Pottel,
T. Davis (Mass.),
R. E. Fenton,
Charles Case,
Homer E. Royce,
Robert B. Hall,
David Kilgore,
John M. Wood,
Charles J. Gilman,
J. W. Sherman,
O. B. Matteson,
E. P. Walton,
Francis E. Spinner,
Wm. H. Kelsey,
Wm. A. Howard,
Henry Waldron,
John Sherman,
George W. Palmer,
Daniel W. Gooch,
Henry L. Dawes,
Justin S. Morrill,
Israel Washburne, Jr.
Sidney Dean,
De Witt C. Leach,

J. F. Farnsworth,
Phileman Bliss,
T. Davis (Iowa),
Isaiah D. Clawson,
Valentine B. Horton,
William Stewart,
John M. Parker,
Chas. B. Hoard,
Wm. D. Brayton,
Richard Mott,
James Wilson,
Silas M. Burroughs,
J. A. Bingham,
Wm. Kellogg,
E. B. Washburne,
Benjamin Stanton,
Edward Dodd,
C. B. Tompkins,
John Covode,
Cad. C. Washburne,
P. G. Adams,
N. B. Durfee,
John F. Potter,
C. L. Knapp,
Mason W. Tappan,
James Pike,
A. S. Murray,
F. H. Morse,
Samuel K. Curtis,
Stephen C. Foster,
John Thompson,
Jas. Buffington,
Geo. B. Robbins,
S. A. Purviance.

Hear also what Wm. H. Seward, the great leader of the "Irrepressible Conflict" *Black* Republican Faction says about it: "I have read the 'Impending Crisis of the South' with deep attention. It seems to me a work of great merit, rich, yet *accurate*, in statistical information, and logical in analysis."

Mr. Seward recommends this book of Helper's as being "accurate." Now we propose to show that, instead of "accurate," it is far from being so. On the 8th page, at the top, the author says, "At the time of the adoption of the Constitution, in 1789, *we* commenced an even race with the North. All things considered, if either the North or the South had the advantage, it was the latter." Then the author goes on to prove, by comparing New York and Virginia together, and says: "In 1790, when the first Census was taken, New York contained 340,120 inhabitants; at the same time, the population of Virginia was 748,308, being more than twice the number of New York."

Now it is clearly proved by the published Compendium of the Census of 1850 by Congress, that the *real* excess of her population, in 1790, was owing to the large amount of her colored population.

On page 45 of "Census Compendium," it will be seen that, in 1790, Virginia had the following population:—

Whites.....	442,045
Page 63,	
Free Negroes.....	12,766
Page 82,	
Slaves.....	293,427

Making the whole amount of

Whites.....	442,045
Negroes (Free and Slave).....	306,193

Total majority of Whites.....135,852

New York had, in 1790,

Whites.....	314,142
Free Colored.....	4,654
Slaves	21,324

Making the whole amount of

Whites.....	314,142
Negroes (Free and Slave).....	26,078

Total majority of Whites..... 288,064

Now we intend to show that, in 1790, the following States were not in the Union, viz. :—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Texas, nor the District of Columbia (of which part belonged to Virginia, and the other Maryland). Indiana, Illinois and Ohio were a part of Virginia; and when ceded to the United States, necessarily took with them a part of the population of Virginia. In 1800, Indiana was ceded to the United States by Virginia, with the following population :—

Whites.....	2,574
Free Colored.....	163
Slaves	135

Total.....2,872

Ohio was ceded also, in 1800, with the following population :—

Whites	24,423
Free Colored.....	337

Total.....24,770

There were no slaves in this State until 1830, and they amounted to six in number.

Illinois was ceded in 1810, with the following population:—

Whites	6,380
Free Colored.	613
Slaves.....	168
Total.....	7,161

Thus taking away quite a large amount of her population.

But, before considering Mr. Helper and the “Impending Crisis of the South,” we will consider the Black Republican party, as it is for this party’s benefit that Mr. Helper’s book was published, and under their direction.

We intend to show that a dissolution of the Union is the object of the Abolition “Republican” party; and, in doing so, it would be a very easy thing to show, by testimony on record, enough to satisfy every patriotic and *Constitutional* Union man in the country, that this is their aim and object by their attacks on the South and her institutions.

The ablest of the anti-slavery agitators belong to the “Anti-Slavery Republican Party.” This title for their “PARTY” may be very distasteful to them, but, nevertheless, it is the true name for their organization. The “Republican party could not exist another day, were it not for that prominent section of their platform avowing its hostility to the Institution of Slavery. The head-quarters for carrying on their operations are England and Massachu-

setts, and they do not attempt to conceal it. A number of the London *Telegraph* of 1856, one of their British organs, says :

“There are now over three millions of human beings held in cruel bondage in the United States. If, therefore, the United States Government deny, and is resolved to question, the right of Great Britain to her Central American possessions, we, the people of the British Empire, are resolved to strike off the shackles from the feet of her three millions of slaves. And there are those among us who will sanctify such a glorious cause.” The London *News*, speaking of a probability of a war between Great Britain and the United States, says: “The *Abolitionists would be with us to a man. The best of them are so now.*” Conservative people of the North, look at this,—the “*Republican*” Party are willing to sell your country into the hands of our enemy (England), for two pieces of silver, instead of thirty, as Judas did his Lord.

In each number of one of the leading newspapers of this so-called “*Republican*” Party, published at Boston, there appeared at the head of its columns, during the campaign of 1856, when John C. Fremont was their standard-bearer, the following motto, in prominent characters:—“*No Union with Slaveholders! The United States Constitution is a covenant with Death, and an agreement with Hell!*” And this, together with several other papers published in that section, constantly, openly and boldly advocated an immediate dissolution of the

Union. At the twenty-third annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, which convened at Boston on the 24th day of January, 1856, it was

“Resolved, That the one great issue before the Country is the dissolution of the Union, in comparison with which all other issues with the Slave-power are as dust in the balance. Therefore, we will give ourselves to the work of annulling this covenant with death, as essential to our own innocence and the speedy and everlasting overthrow of the slave system.”

On that occasion, Wendell Phillips commenced his speech in favor of disunion thus:—“I entirely accord with the sentiment of that last resolution. I think *all we have to do is to prepare the public mind, by the daily and hourly presentation of the doctrine of disunion.* Events which, fortunately for us, the Government itself, and other parties, are producing with unexampled rapidity, are our best aid.”

And this speech, continued in this spirit, was applauded throughout by the audience there assembled.

On the 18th day of December, 1855, Mr. Giddings, in the House of Representatives, made a speech on the organization of the House, in which, after heaping upon the South the most insulting epithets,—and thereby, so far as in him lay, weakening the bonds of the Union,—in alluding to a remark that the aggressions of the Black Republicans, if continued, would lead to a destruction of the Government, he turned to the Southern members, and, in a tone

of bravado, remarked: "You shall not dissolve the Union. With unwavering determination, we say to those traitors, You shall not dissolve it!" The *Boston Liberator*, of the 11th of January last, thus gently reproves the insincerity of his friend: "Mr. Giddings says truly that the dissolution of the Union has long been held up as a scarecrow by the South; but when he adds that the friends of liberty have never demanded it, his statement is untrue, unless he means to confine it to his political associates, who are but compromisers at best. We demand nothing short of a dissolution, absolute and immediate. The Union, which has been founded by our fathers, was cemented by the blood of the slave, and effected through his immolation."

On the national anniversary, the 4th of July, 1856, when the whole American people should have sent up one united heart to the throne of God in gratitude for the countless blessings showered upon us, a mass meeting was held at Framingham, in Massachusetts, at which several disunion speeches were made, and received with applause. Our space will not allow us to give extracts from but two. Wm. Lloyd Garrison said:—

"Let us then, to-day, rejecting as wild and chimerical all suggestions and contrivances and propositions for restraining slavery in its present limits, while extending constitutional protection to it in fifteen of the thirty-one States, register our pledge anew before Heaven and the world, that *we will do what in us lies to effect the eternal*

overthrow of this blood-stained Union, that thus our enslaved countrymen may find a sure deliverance, and we may no longer be answerable for their blood." J. B. Swassey, Esq., who addressed the meeting at the same time, said: "In the old times, I was called an Anti-Slavery Whig. But, Mr. President, it has come to my mind like a conviction, that it is utterly in vain to hope that we can live under such a Government as this with our professions, and with our pretended love of freedom and right. Why, the thing is impossible. There cannot, in the nature of things, be any union between the principles of liberty and slavery. There never has been any union, except by the subjugation of the principles of liberty to those of despotism. For one, sir, *I believe that the duty of every true man is now to take the ground of secession.*" A writer in the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, writing from Newburg, on the Hudson River, under date of May 28th, 1856, said: "But I waste words. In this fearful crisis one hope is left us,—the hope that the people of the North will see the jeopardy in which they stand, and will look disunion calmly in the face. Let those of us who feel this wrong throw away these miserable party divisions, and, lifting up our eyes to that Heaven where Liberty, the daughter of God, stands forever by her Father's throne, STRIKE in her name, and but one blow!"

We know it will be said that these are the sentiments of the ultra Abolitionists, and that those *virtuous gentle-*

men, Seward, Greeley, Giddings, Fremont, Banks, Cameron, Wilson, Wade, and Company, do not intend to go quite so far. We implore you, fellow-citizens of the North, if you love your country, to hug no such delusive hope to your bosoms. Those whose sentiments we have quoted see the inevitable tendency of this Anti-Slavery agitation, and frankly avow their objects. But those last-named are endeavoring to conceal their real purposes, and, by exciting and misleading the masses, make them instruments for their own destruction. The Garrison school and the Seward school are identical in their objects, instruments, and results. They trim their sails to the same winds, and will arrive at precisely the same port. They sing the same song of "Slave aggression," "Slave oligarchy," "Bleeding Kansas," and "Slave democracy," and they sing it to precisely the same tune.

Horace Greeley, the pilot of the disunion craft, on which Seward is captain, and Giddings, Sherman, Banks, Cameron, Wilson, Wade, Chase, Fremont, Bissell, Wentworth, Lovejoy and Company have taken passage, just before the passage of the Kansas Act, gave his command for agitation in these words: "We urge, therefore, unbending determination on the part of the Northern members hostile to this intolerable outrage, and demand of them, in behalf of peace, in behalf of freedom, in behalf of justice and humanity, *resistance to the last*. Better that confusion should ensue—better that discord should reign in the national councils—better that Congress should break up

in wild disorder—nay, *better that the Capitol itself should blaze by the torch of the incendiary, or fall and bury all its inmates beneath its crumbling ruins*—than that this perfidy and wrong should be finally accomplished!”

Seward, who is the very life and soul of this party, as far back as 1848, in a speech made at Cleveland, *six years before the passage of the Kansas Nebraska Act*, gave the world a very clear intimation of the plan of operations which they are now carrying out. He says: “Correct your own error—that slavery has any constitutional guarantee which may not be released, and ought not to be relinquished. Say to Slavery, when it shows its bond (that is, the Constitution) and demands its pound of flesh, that, if it draws one drop of blood, its life shall pay the forfeit.” * * * * “Do all this, and inculcate all this in the spirit of moderation and benevolence, and not of retaliation and fanaticism, and *you will soon bring the parties of the country into an effective aggression upon Slavery.*”

Senator Wilson of Massachusetts, another active leader, in a lecture delivered at Tremont Temple, Boston, last Spring, says: “Send it abroad on the wings of the wind, that I am committed, fully committed, committed to the fullest extent, in favor of *immediate and unconditional abolition of Slavery* wherever it exists under the authority of the Constitution of the United States.”

And again, in a letter dated June 20th, 1855, to Wendell Phillips, an extract from one of whose disunion

speeches we have given above, Wilson says: "I hope, my dear sir, that we shall all strive to unite and combine all the friends of freedom, that we shall forget each other's *faults and short-comings* in the past, and all labor to secure that co-operation, by which alone *the slave is to be emancipated*, and the dominion of his master broken. Let us remember that more than three millions of bondmen, groaning under nameless woes, demand that we shall cease to reproach each other, and *that we labor for their deliverance.*"

We will now, without comment, give a few additional extracts from speeches and writings of the leaders of the *Black "Republican Party,"* and which are so numerous, and becoming more so every day, that we shall, for the want of space, be able to quote only a few.

"The Union is not worth supporting in connection with the South."—HORACE GREELY.

"I look forward to the day when there shall be a servile insurrection in the South; when the black man armed with *British bayonets*, and led on by *British officers*, shall assert his freedom, and wage a war of extermination against his master; *when the torch of the incendiary shall light up the towns and cities of the South*, and blot out the last vestige of slavery; and though I may not laugh at their calamity, nor mock when their fear cometh, *yet I shall hail it as the dawn of a political millennium.*"—GIDDINGS.

"I am willing, in a certain state of circumstances, to

let the Union slide.”—N. P. BANKS, once Speaker of the U. S. House of Representatives, now Governor of Massachusetts.

“In the case of the alternative being presented, of the continuance of slavery or a dissolution of the Union, I am for dissolution, *and I care not how soon it comes.*”—

RUFUS B. SPAULDING.

“I detest slavery, and say unhesitatingly, that I am for its abolition by some means, *if it should send all the party organizations in the Union, or the Union itself, to the devil.*”—H. M. ADDISON, of the *American Advertiser*.

“Better disunion, better a civil or a servile war, better any thing that God in his providence shall send, than an extension of the bonds of slavery.”—HORACE MANN.

“If peaceful means fail us, and we are driven to the last extremity, where ballots are useless, then we’ll make bullets effective.”—Hon. ERASTUS HOPKINS, of Massachusetts.

“On the action of this Convention depends the fate of the country; if the ‘REPUBLICANS’ fail at the ballot-box, we will be forced to drive back the slaveocracy **WITH FIRE AND THE SWORD.**”—Genl. WATSON WEBB, in a speech in the Convention that nominated FREMONT, and which was received with “**TREMENDOUS APPLAUSE.**”

“The remedy is to go to the polls, and through the ballot-box repudiate the infamous platform put forth at Cincinnati, and over which the black flag of slavery

waves with characteristic impudence; and failing in this, do as our fathers did before us—stand by our inalienable rights, *and drive back, with arms*, those who dare to trample upon our inheritance.”—From Genl. WEBB's *editorial in his paper*.

“I sincerely hope a civil war may burst upon the country. I want to see American slavery abolished in my day. It is a legacy I have no wish to leave my children. *Then my most fervent prayer is, that England, France, and Spain may speedily take this slavery-accursed nation into their special consideration*, and when the time arrives *for the streets of the cities of this ‘land of the free and home of the brave’ to run with blood to the horses’ bridles*, if the writer of this be living, there will be one heart to rejoice at the retributive justice of Heaven.”—W. O. DUVALL, “*one of the leading Republicans of New York.*”

“It is the duty of the North, in case they fail in electing a President and Congress that will restore freedom in Kansas, to revolutionize the government.”—Resolution of a “Black” Republican meeting in Wisconsin.

“By all her regard for the generations of the future, by her reverence for God and man, the North is bound to dissolve her present union with kidnappers and murderers, and form a Northern Republic on the basis of “No union with slaveholders.”—HENRY C. WRIGHT, writing from Waukegan, Illinois, under date of June 9th, 1856, to one of the Northern papers.

“*Resolved*, that the slavery advocates may prate to their heart's content about the ‘*Glorious Union*,’ the mighty advantages resulting therefrom, the dangers to which it is exposed, arising from the agitation of the slavery question, and the incalculable evils consequent upon its dissolution. We, as friends of human freedom, know no political union, and acknowledge none but that based on the equality and brotherhood of man. Every other union is a shadow without substance. We, moreover, in all sincerity declare, that, if the Union of these United States is built upon slavery, it is not worth preserving. YEA, LET IT BE DASHED INTO A THOUSAND FRAGMENTS, rather than serve as a perpetuation of wholesale robbery.”—*Resolution passed at a Black Republican meeting at Farlow's Grove, Mercer County, Illinois.*

“I tell you, fellow-citizens, the Harper's Ferry outbreak was the legitimate consequence of the teachings of the Republican party.”—Senator WILSON, of Massachusetts, in a speech delivered at Syracuse, New York, on the 28th October, 1859.

After this exhibit, and the recollection of the fact that the most of these men have been continued for years in high positions, it will not perhaps surprise the public to hear that the people of Ohio have just elected Mr. Dennison, governor, who, during the canvass, is reported to have made the following declaration in one of his public speeches

"If I am elected governor of Ohio—and I expect to be—I will not let any fugitive be returned to Kentucky, or any other slave State; and if I cannot prevent it in any other way, as commander-in-chief of the military of the State, I will employ the bayonet—*so help me God!*"

When such doctrines as these are announced from men high in office, and high in the confidence of a political party which threatens to get possession of the Government, shall we express surprise and astonishment that there should be found men like Brown and his associates ready and willing to do in practice what Seward, Wilson, Sumner, Giddings, and Dennison, tell them is right, just, and holy? Brown was caught in the act, and suffered with his associates the penalty of the law. They deserved their fate; and no honest patriot has a tear to shed over their graves. But what shall we say of the master spirits who have stimulated, by their maddening appeals and treasonable teachings, these deluded men to rebellion and bloodshed? They are politicians who ask for public confidence, and would have the people intrust to their hands the administration of this great Government, with all its cares, interests, and responsibilities. In advance, they notify the country what may be expected from them if the power is given to them. It certainly requires no gift of foreknowledge to read the future of this country if, in an evil hour, the people should place in power the men and party who, we have shown, are justly responsible before God and man for these acts of violence and blood-

shed. It is time that the sober-minded and patriotic men of the North should look to these things. The issue is precipitated upon us, and cannot be longer postponed. We must meet it, and save the country, or be prepared to suffer in the general ruin which these reckless men are rapidly bringing upon the country.

Now, we do charge the Republicans with complicity in the Harper's Ferry outrage, although some of their journals try to deny the fact. We give a few honest sentiments by a Republican paper. The *Winstead (Ct.) Herald* is a Republican paper, and has fought manfully for that party. The editor is an Abolitionist, and has no concealment to make of his views in regard to old John Brown. The following is from the *Winstead Herald*, October 27 :

“And here we may as well say, we have no admiration for that class of Republican newspapers which are so eager to disclaim and disavow all fellowship and sympathy for Old John Brown. Did they stop here, we could be patient with them ; but when they go further, and pelt him with the titles of madman, crazy, *muddled*, and *insane*, we say out upon them for hypocrites and traitors—‘little villains,’ unworthy to lick or feel the foot of Old John Brown. His plans may have been INJUDICIOUS—we are not at present able to judge of them ; but it is plainly evident *his friends did not stick by him in the hour of trial as men stood by each other eighty years ago*. The fault may not be his but OURS. When men pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor eighty years ago, they meant what they said.

and performed what they promised. We are sorrowfully suspicious that in Old Brown's case men did differently. At all events, he is unsuccessful, and so Republican presses, the country over, fearful that their party would somehow lose a vote and themselves an office, fall to mouthing Old Brown as heartily as twelve months since they praised, and vied with each other in denouncing and abusing him. For shame! Old Brown had more nobleness in his soul, more honesty in his heart, more principle in his action, more courage in a single finger, than all such politicians from Maine to Oregon. He dared to undertake what *you* in the security of your *sanctums* only are BOLD TO PREACH. He failed; had he succeeded, fifty coming years would have *sanctified his grave with the holiness of a second Mount Vernon*, granite and marble columns would rise to his memory, and the nation would add another to her jubilee days, whereon her orators would utter their noblest sentences in eulogy of Old John Brown. Alas! it was not so to be—the slave toils on in an unloosened chain, the hero gasps in a dungeon, and the Republican press cannot find room enough for their renunciations and denunciations of demented Old John Brown.

“For one, we confess we love him—we *honor* him, we *applaud* him. He is honest in his principles, courageous in their defense, and we have yet to be taught, reading from that Book of Inspiration we all acknowledge, how and wherein Old John Brown is a transgressor. Do with him as we will, his ashes will some day be gathered to a hero's

tomb, his name will be written with the Winklereids, and Tells, and Washingtons of history, and the American school-boy shall yet be taught to listen with moistening eye and beating heart to the story of Old John Brown."

It must be evident to every fair-minded and honorable man, that if John Brown had succeeded in his aims and objects, that the Republican Party would, as we quote above from an editorial of the "*Winstead (Ct.) Herald*," celebrate his death (that is, a natural death) as true American people now do the birthday of "the Father of his Country." "Granite and marble columns would rise to his memory, and the nation would add another to her jubilee days."

No later than the 26th of March, Mr. BLAKE, of Ohio, offered the following resolution in the House of Representatives, to stir up a dissolution of the Union.

WHEREAS the chattelizing of humanity and the holding of persons as property is contrary to natural justice and the fundamental principles of our political system, and is notoriously a reproach to our country throughout the civilized world, and a serious hindrance to the progress of republican liberty among the nations of the earth: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and the same are hereby, instructed to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill giving freedom to every human being, and interdicting slavery wherever Congress has the constitutional power to legislate on the subject.

Mr. SMITH, of Virginia, and others, objected. [Cries from the Democratic benches of "Don't object!"]

Several MEMBERS. Let the resolution be read again.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. BLAKE. I trust that, as the resolution is one of reference only, there will be no objection.

Mr. BARKSDALE. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the introduction of the resolution? [Cries of "Don't object!"] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BRANCH. I object to the preamble. [Cries of "It is too late!"]

Mr. HINDMAN. I hope that there will be no objection to the introduction of the resolution. Let it come in, and let us have the yeas and nays upon it. Let us make up the record.

Mr. SINGLETON. I hope that all objection will be withdrawn. I want, upon the vote by yeas and nays, to let the country see how many Representatives upon this floor will vote for such a resolution.

Mr. BRANCH. At the request of friends all round me, I withdraw my objection to the preamble.

Mr. SINGLETON. I demand the yeas and nays on the adoption of the resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken on the adoption of the resolution; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 60, nays 109; as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Charles F. Adams, Aldrich, Alley, Bingham, Blair, Blake, Brayton, Buffington, Burlingame, Burroughs, Butterfield, Carey, Carter, Colfax, Conkling, Curtis, Delano, Duell, Edgerton, Edwards, Eliot, Ely, Farnsworth, Foster, Frank, Gooch, Grow, Gurley, Hale, Helmick, Hoard, Humphrey, Hutchins, Francis W. Kellog, DeWitt C. Leach, Lee, Lovejoy, McKean, Morrill, Olin, Palmer, Potter, Pottle, Rice, Sedgwick, Sherman, Somes, Spaulding, Spinner, William Stewart, Tappan, Tompkins, Train, Vandever, Waldron, Walton,

Cadwalader C. Washburn, Elihu B. Washburne, Wells, and Windom—60.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Thomas L. Anderson, Ashmore, Avery, Barksdale, Barr, Barrett, Boccock, Boteler, Boyce, Branch, Briggs, Bristow, Burch, Burnett, Campbell, John B. Clark, Clopton, Cobb, John Cochrane, Cooper, Cox, James Craig, Burton Craige, Crawford, Curry, H. Winter Davis, John G. Davis, Reuben Davis, De Jarnette, Dunn, Edmundson, Etheridge, Florence, Fouke, French, Garnett, Gartrell, Gilmer, Hamilton, Hardeman, J. Morrison Harris, John T. Harris, Hatton, Hickman, Hill, Hindman, Holman, Houston, Hughes, Jackson, Jenkins, Jones, Keitt, Kenyon, Kunkel, Lamar, Landrum, James M. Leach, Leake, Logan, Love, Mallory, Charles D. Martin, Elbert S. Martin, McKnight, McPherson, McQueen, McRae, Miles, Millson, Millward, Montgomery, Laban, T. Moore, Sydenham Moore, Edward Joy Morris, Isaac N. Morris, Niblack, Nixon, Nbell, Phelps, Porter, Prior, Pugh, Quarles, Reagan, Riggs, James C. Robinson, Ruffin, Schwartz, Scott, Scranton, Simms, Singleton, William Smith, Stallworth, Stevenson, James A. Stewart, Stokes, Taylor, Thayer, Thomas, Trimble, Underwood, Valandigham, Whiteley, Winslow, Woodson, and Wright—109.

So the resolution was rejected.

Pending the above call,

Mr. DUNN said: I move that the resolution be laid upon the table.

Mr. PHELPS. That motion is not in order. The Clerk has proceeded with the call of the roll, and there has been a response; and pending the call of the roll, no other business is in order. The roll-call must be proceeded with.

Mr. DUNN. I made my motion in time.

Mr. PHELPS. The call of the roll was proceeded with, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Adams] answered in the affirmative.

Mr. HINDMAN. And I heard his response.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk has recorded the name of the gentleman from Massachusetts in the affirmative.

Mr. PHELPS. Then the motion to lay upon the table is not in order, and cannot be received.

The SPEAKER. Such is the decision of the Chair. The motion of the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. Dunn,] that the resolution be laid upon the table, was not made until the call of the roll was commenced and there was a response, and it is of course out of order, and cannot be entertained.

Mr. BARR, when his name was called, said: I desire to say a word in reference to my vote. I am opposed to all this agitation of the slavery question in every sense. ["Order!" "Order!"] I vote "no."

Mr. BOULIGNY. I am paired off with Mr. Ashley, of Ohio. If I were to vote I should vote "no."

Mr. FRANK stated that Mr. Burnham was paired off with Mr. Sickles.

Mr. DAVIDSON. My colleague on the Committee on Enrolled Bills [Mr. Theaker] is detained from the House, and I cannot vote while he is absent. If I could vote, I should vote "no."

Mr. DAWES. Last week I paired off upon all questions of this character with Mr. Webster, of Maryland; otherwise I should vote in the affirmative.

Mr. FRANK stated that Mr. Ferry was paired off with Mr. Maclay.

Mr. KILGORE. I desire to give the reasons——

Mr. BURNETT. I object to all debate.

The SPEAKER. All debate is out of order.

Mr KILGORE. Will the gentleman allow me to give the reasons for my vote?

Mr. BURNETT. No, sir; vote "aye," or "no," without explanation.

Mr. MARTIN, of Virginia, when his name was called, said:

ask the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. Kilgore,] to give his attention a moment. I believe he paired me off with Mr. Case until twelve o'clock to-day.

Mr. KILGORE. That is so; and I would be glad, as Mr. Case is not here, if the gentleman would extend his pair until Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN, of Virginia. As I have a right to vote, I vote "no." I would disgrace my district should I make an explanation.

Mr. STOKES stated that Mr. Maynard was paired off with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. LOGAN stated that his colleague, Mr. McClernand, was paired off with Mr. Kellogg, of Illinois, for the day.

Mr. MOORE, of Kentucky. I desire to announce the pair of my colleague, Mr. Peyton, (who has been called home by the sickness of his daughter,) with Mr. Wood, from the 24th of March, for twenty days.

It was stated that Mr. Fenton was detained in his room by illness.

Mr. McKNIGHT stated that Mr. Morehead was paired off with Mr. Lamar on all questions on which there might be an antagonism between them.

Mr. BRABSON stated that Mr. Nelson was paired off with Mr. Killinger.

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. I desire to have the forty-second rule read, requiring all members present to vote. I want it read now during the call of the roll, as I notice that several members have declined to vote. I want every man in the House to vote on this resolution.

Mr. STEWART, of Pennsylvania. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection being made, the rule cannot be read now.

Mr. SICKLES. I have paired off with Mr. Burnham, of Connecticut, upon this and kindred questions; otherwise I would have been glad to extinguish this firebrand by voting "no."

Mr. STEVENS, of Pennsylvania. I was paired off with Mr. Clemens until to-day; but as he is not here, I decline to vote.

Mr. GILMER stated that Mr. Vance was paired off with Mr. Covode.

Mr. McKNIGHT stated that Mr. Verree was paired off.

Mr. ENGLISH. I was not within the bar of the House when my name was called; had I been present, I should have voted "no."

Mr. KILLINGER stated that he was paired off with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. FRENCH. I did not answer when my name was called, because I was not certain of the purport of the resolution. I have examined it, and regard it as ill-advised and ill-considered.

Mr. HOWARD stated that he had paired off with Mr. Case.

Mr. BONHAM. I merely desire to say that perhaps I ought to be paired with the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, [Mr. Staunton.] A friend of his called on the honorable gentleman from Virginia and myself to-day, and spoke about procuring a pair with Mr. Staunton. I would have paired with him with great pleasure, and will pair with him now, although I do not know that I have a right to say that he would like to pair off with me on this question. If his friends on that side of the House are agreed, I am willing to take that course, and that it shall be regarded as a pair from the beginning. I should have paired with him if he could have got no one else. I have only to say, in addition, that I would have voted against the resolution.

Mr. BRABSON. Then I say, that, if I had been entitled to vote, I would have recorded my vote in the negative.

Mr. DIMMICK. If I had been within the bar, I would have voted "no."

In giving the votes to the public, on this firebrand resolution of Mr. Blake, copied from the *Congressional Globe*, we do so to substantiate assertions made by us: that the

terior purpose of the Republican party is the abolition of slavery.

To the mind of an unprejudiced spectator of this combat between constitutionality and anarchy, the fact that sixty members of the House of Representatives *voted for it*, is a significant and unmistakable sign. Too *truly* might we repeat, with melancholy fitness of application, the prophetic curse of Catiline. There is, there can be, no reason assigned why, when such things become common,

“Massacre” should not

Seal our “eternal destiny in blood.”

It is too true, that although

“A thousand years scarce serves to form a State :

An hour may lay it in the dust.”

Now we proclaim, secondly, that disunion would be the inevitable result of the success of the Black Republican party.

We should not, fellow-citizens of the North, be dealing with you with that candor which you have a right to expect, if we were to assert that the great mass of the people, whose minds have been lashed into this storm of fury and fanaticism, were at heart the enemies of their country, or desire its destruction. Indeed, I know that such is not the case. But the danger to the Republic is, therefore, none the less. No free government has ever yet been destroyed by foreign enemies, as long as the people understood their true interests.

It is only where demagogues have been able to take advantage of the honest impulses of the masses, and deceive

and mislead them, that republics have ever fallen before the assaults of their enemies. In this way have fondest hopes of mankind, time and again, been blasted; and it is in this way that the fairest fabric of human government ever vouchsafed to man, is now in danger of being destroyed.

What is the American Union? Of what does it consist? And on what is it based? It is not the parchment on which the Constitution is written. It is not made up of any particular formula of words, and it cannot be preserved by the power of the sword. *The very life of the Union is in the hearts of the American people.* It is made up of mutual forbearance and mutual concession—of honest, heartfelt love and affection for a common country, and every portion thereof. And this affection cannot be maintained without equal and exact justice to the whole country, and to every citizen. Our brethren of the North must learn to attend to their own business, and refrain from crimination, and this ceaseless, insulting, maddening opprobrium, heaped upon the institutions, customs, habits, and prejudices of their neighbors, their brothers, and equal heirs to the blessings of our matchless government.

Professions of devotion to the Union amount to nothing when you show by your conduct that you are cultivating feelings and principles which must lead to its destruction. The "Republican" Convention, by a kind of solemn mockery, proclaim their devotion to the Union, whilst one of the most able leaders of that party, judging

of others by his own feelings, declares that "there is really no union between the North and the South; and he believed no two nations upon the earth entertained feelings of more bitter rancor toward each other, than these two sections of the Republic."

Mr. Giddings, while in the House, reviled the institutions of fifteen States of this Union, trampled upon our habits, customs and prejudices, and insulted our people, and then turned to our representatives there, and exclaimed, "You shall not dissolve this Union!" and threatened us with a halter if we attempted to withdraw.

Senator Wilson, in the United States Senate, denounced the South, but at the same time, asserted that there is no danger of secession; that the South could not be *kicked* out of the Union. The same Senator, in a speech he made in the covention which nominated Fremont, proclaimed, as the motto of the party—"Freemen of the North have a right to govern the country."

Twelve of the thirteen original States of the Union were slave States, or recognized the existence of slavery among them. While the free States were in the minority, all was peace, concord and harmony, as far as this question was concerned. There was no complaint then of aggression on the one part or the other.

We of the South have never attempted, in any way, to intrude our institutions upon the people of the North; but, on the contrary, our statesmen had commenced, in good faith, considering as to the best method of loosening the

fetters of the slave, and of finally effecting his emancipation. But it was found impracticable to do so, for various reasons which we will speak of hereafter.

The fact is, no sooner had the North obtained the majority in the Confederacy, than the senseless and unholy agitation was commenced, which has fastened the bonds of the slave so that, we will venture the assertion, they never will be loosened by peaceful means.

You have agitated this vexed question to such an extent, that we tell you, candidly and honestly, you have brought our country to the very brink of ruin. You have nearly majority in both branches of Congress, the most of whom are the representatives of a sectional faction, standing on a sectional platform antagonistic to the institutions of the South. Having eighteen millions of citizens, while we have but six millions of whites, with your prosperity and numbers,—for which you owe gratitude to the South,—you have, instead of being grateful, now become arrogant, overbearing, and insulting. It is not the desire of the South to withdraw from the Union, if she can remain in it consistent with her own sense of right, justice, and dignity, and so long as the Union can be preserved inviolate of the spirit of harmony that brought it into being. But when she is to be deprived of her just rights, and her equality in the Union, then she is in favor of disunion.

The monstrous doctrine is promulgated, that fifteen States of the Union are to be wholly disregarded, and that the “freemen of the North have a right to govern this

country." Govern it, how? By cultivating sentiments of affection for every portion of our country? By equal and just laws, and the recognition of the perfect equality of all the States of the Union? Not at all! On the contrary, they propose to govern it by usurpation, and the power of numbers and the sword.

They propose, under the plausible cry of No more Slave States, to shut us out from those magnificent Territories acquired by the blood of our fathers, brothers, sires and kindred as well as by those of the North, unless we will abandon property which has descended to us, and institutions under which our fathers and we have lived and prospered. Now, we charge that the Republican party propose to seize upon the Federal Government, and reduce us to subjection under their lash. They propose to maintain this Union just as the union between England and Ireland is maintained—just as Great Britain attempted to maintain the union between the Mother Country and her American Colonies.

Conservative people of the North, we implore you to pause, and ask yourselves whether our government can be preserved in any such way. The Republican party says it can; hence their cry, "The Federal Union, it must and shall be preserved." "Be preserved" for their own benefit, and not for the benefit of the whole country. We, of the South, love this Union, bought at so great a sacrifice, and we would deplore a severance of it as a great public calamity; for in the language of President Buchanan, on

the 22nd of February, 1860, at the Inauguration of the Statue of Washington, at Washington, D. C., "it will teach the generations to come that man is incapable of self-government." But no matter how much we would deplore so great a disaster, we will never submit to repeated wrongs and injustice, and the drawing of so odious a distinction between us and our brethren of the North. We will never submit to degradation. If you think so, try the experiment; but if you do, it will be at your own hazard.

A distinguished Northern man once said, "Let us not be deceived by the cry that the South is weak, and will not, therefore, risk a separation? Our fathers were less than three millions, and were apparently without resources. In the South are six millions of as gallant, high-spirited freemen as ever trod the green sod of our mother earth, with all the elements of a great nation. The North, it is true, *if* united in a war of aggression, is greatly her superior in numbers and wealth. But if we are so lost to all sense of honor as to attempt it, we never could reduce the South to subjection to a government where she could not obtain justice. We might possibly stir up a servile war, desolate her now happy homes, and cause her cities to run rivers of blood. It might be possible for us to sweep her whole population from the earth; but as long as one man was found alive, his arm would be raised to strike the invader, and an enlightened world would applaud the act."

But if we could do so with perfect safety, will we ask our brethren to submit to any such degradation? On every

battle-field of our country the men of the North and the men of the South have marched side by side, as brothers, to victory and glory. "They have poured their blood into one common stream, and locked in each others arms, they filled one common grave." And shall we now say to them, "We are holier than they? Shall we stand up in the market-places, and thank God that we are not as these publicans and sinners? Are we purer than Washington and Jefferson, Madison and Jackson, Calhoun and Clay, all of whom were slaveholders, and lived in slave States? And will we refuse to live under a government which recognizes them and their children as our equals? Do we wish them to occupy toward us a position similar to that occupied by Ireland toward England? I know your hearts too well to have any doubts as to the answer.

Having treated at some length the Republican party, we now propose to consider the most prominent parts, as well as the fallacies of Helper's "Impending Crisis of the South."

CHAPTER II.

Statistical Fallacies of Helper's Book—The True State of the Case—Large Balance in favor of the South—The boasted Free Labor of the North overshadowed by the Productions of the South—Report of the Secretary of the United States' Treasury—The Republican Party trying to Dissolve the Union of the States—The South in favor of Perpetuating the Union of these States as long as their rights are respected—Republican Party a Sectional Party—The Proofs from Northern Men.

WE will now consider some of the statistical fallacies of Helper's book. Not only does this incendiary work abound with incentives to treason, massacre, and bloody revolution, but the statistics are fallacious, and evidently prepared for the purpose of deceiving the ignorant and fanatical portion of the community. The attentive and intelligent reader, who will take the trouble of examining them closely, will easily detect their fallacy. By way of showing the superior productiveness of the free States over the slave States, he compares the value of their respective cereals, and gives at page 22 of the Compendium the following results:

CEREALS.

Free States.....	\$351,709,703
Slave States.....	306,927,067

In favor of the free States.....\$44,782,636

At page 37 the value of the other agricultural products of the North and South are compared as follows :

OTHER AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

Free States.....	\$214,422,523
Slave States.....	155,223,415

In favor of the free States.....\$59,199,108

The aggregate difference between all the agricultural products of the South and North thus appear to be :

TOTAL PRODUCTS.

Free States.....	\$566,132,226
Slave States.....	462,150,482

In favor of the free States.....\$103,981,744

Now, the fallacy of this deduction will be made clear by turning to a table at page 71 of the Compendium, in which the population of the free and slave States is compared :

Northern population.....	13,434,922
Southern population.....	9,612,979

It will be thus seen that the Northern population is one and a half that of the Southern, and yet it does not produce one-fifth more. According to the foregoing figures

the North ought to yield, in order to make its productions equal to the South, \$645,682,722, as any school-boy can calculate by the rule of simple proportion thus :

<i>Southern Population.</i>		<i>Northern Population.</i>			<i>Answer.</i>
9,612,979	:	13,434,922	:	\$462,150,482	: \$645,684,722

The true state of the case, therefore, is :

What they ought to produce	\$645,685,722
What the free States do produce	566,132,226

Against the free States and in favor of slave.....\$39,452,596

Again, if we take the proportion of population to the square mile, the figures will be still more in favor of the South. According to one of the tables quoted in Helper's Compendium, (at page 71,) the population of the South is only 11.29 the square mile, whereas the population of the North is 21.91. By the rule of proportion, the result on this basis ought to be :

<i>Pop. Sq. M.</i>		<i>Pop. Sq. M.</i>			<i>Answer.</i>
11.29	:	21.91	:	\$462,150,482	: \$898,469,181

Now let us subtract what the North actually produces from what it ought to produce on this basis, as follows :

What it ought to produce.....	\$898,469,182
What it actually produced.....	566,132,226

Against the free States.....\$332,336,956

It will be thus seen, according to Helper's own figures, that there is a balance of \$332,336,956 against the free

States, and in favor of the slave, instead of \$103,981,744 to the credit of the Northern States, as the dishonest writer pretends. If we add these two amounts together, the result will show that he lies for abolition to the trifling sum of \$436,318,700—four hundred and thirty-six millions, three hundred and eighteen thousand, seven hundred dollars?

Such is a specimen of his statistics, on which as little reliance is to be placed as on his other facts and arguments against the South. The book is a tissue of falsehoods worthy of the bad cause for which it is written, and its endorsement is a disgrace to all who have given it the sanction of their names.

The ingenuity of man never devised a more effectual or plausible mode of deceiving and misleading the human understanding, than a shrewd arrangement of figures. By this device, Helper has, by an assumed fairness in forming statistical tables, been able to render his book plausible to many persons who are too apt, in most matters, to take whatever is presented to their understanding in the shape of figures, as so;—believing it to be a work of too much labor for figures to lie.

The analysis, however, of Helper's figures, shows a studied and wanton misrepresentation of important facts. In one table he arranges the respective products of the North and South, and very clearly, as he asserts, shows that white labor is much more productive than slave labor. It is due to the superior ingenuity and skill of the white

man over the dull and torpid African to admit that fact; but we deny that Helper has honestly shown it; upon the contrary we show that, by a fair comparison of the number of inhabitants to the square mile, the South produces *much more than the North*.

We are aware that prejudice has much to do with warping a man's judgment, and blinding his understanding; but we cannot reconcile it with a true spirit of patriotism, or high-toned sense of honor, when the emanations of that prejudice are attempted to be palmed off upon the public as historical facts. We will not allow the bias of our prejudices to claim (notwithstanding the facts would warrant us in doing so) that slave labor is more productive than white, but we claim that it is better adapted to the corn, cotton, sugar and rice fields than white labor, for the reason that the system of management suits better, and their peculiar nature is better suited to the climate where those products are most abundantly grown.

No man but a bigot would deny but there are some men among the large number of producers at the South who calculate and investigate as to the most expeditious and effectual mode of accumulating wealth,—they experiment, and institute a rigid comparison of the respective productiveness of slave and white labor, and, doubtless, if their *practice* had proven that the latter was the most remunerative, they would have adhered to it.

With such manifest unfairness, as the analysis of the statistics which we have here given shows, it would war-

rant the suspicion and belief that this "Helper Book," like most of the arguments of the leading "Black Republicans," is a mere cunningly devised compilation of spirited extracts from sundry speeches, messages, etc., of prominent men, and forced statistics, gotten up designedly to inflame and mislead the Northern masses.

The exportable products of the fifteen Slave States amount annually to \$270,000,000 exclusive of gold and foreign merchandise re-exported; and their annual demand for the productions of other countries is about \$225,000,000. There are 80,000 cotton plantations in the South, and the aggregate value of their annual products is \$128,000,000. There are 16,000 tobacco plantations, and their annual products amount to \$15,000,000. There are 2,600 sugar plantations, the products of which average annually \$13,000,000. There are 700 rice plantations, which yield annually a revenue of \$6,000,000. Breadstuffs and provisions yield \$78,000,000; the products of the forest amount to \$10,700,000; manufactures yield \$31,000,000; and the products of the sea yield \$3,356,000; exclusive of \$30,000,000 we send to the North!

These facts and figures rest mostly upon the authority of the *Southern Cultivator*, *De Bow's Review*, and the speeches in Congress of Senator Hammond, and Hon. L. M. Keitt, M.C. of South Carolina. But we are happy to find them sustained by the Secretary of the Treasury, in a late Report; and laid before Congress by "His Excellency President Buchanan," and by him endorsed.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in a late Report, sets down the exportation of domestic produce, exclusive of specie, at \$266,438,051. Of this amount, cotton, which is exclusively from the South, furnishes \$128,382,351; tobacco gives \$12,221,843, and rice yields \$2,390,233,—both of which, also, are *exclusively* Southern; breadstuffs and provisions are estimated at \$77,686,455; products of the forest at \$10,694,184; of manufactures at \$30,970,992; of the sea at \$3,356,797. Now take \$128,382,351 for the value of cotton, and \$12,221,843 for tobacco, and \$2,390,233 for rice, which are exclusively Southern staples, and we have the sum of \$142,994,427, which the South contributes to the exportations of the country, in these staple products, which, in the Union, are only raised within her limits. But her contribution does not stop here. Of the \$77,686,455 furnished by breadstuffs and provisions, she contributed at least \$25,000,000; of the products of the forest, in the shape of lumber, etc., she contributed about \$5,000,000, or *one-half* of the exportation. Then \$30,000,000, added to the \$142,994,427, which we have already shown was furnished by cotton, tobacco and rice, make up \$172,994,427, out of the \$266,438,051, to which the whole domestic exportation amounts. This would leave \$93,443,051 for the domestic exportation from all the free States. But this is more than they are entitled to. Of the 30,970,992 contributed by domestic manufactures, at least \$10,000,000 is the value of the raw material not grown at the North. This leaves only \$83,442,624 as the

contribution of the free States, against \$172,994,427, as the contribution of the Southern or slave States, to the domestic exportation of the country.

Where is Mr. Helper, and his boasted free labor of the North? Echo answers,—Where? Seeing this, well may the South exclaim, “Quæ regio interiis nostri non plena laboris.”

The following we quote from *The Constitution*, Dec. 7, which speaks for itself:

“We know of no subject of greater interest to the public; and especially to the statesman, than the information that will soon be laid before the country by the proper department of the Government, embracing the imports and exports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1859. At all times important, it is doubly so at the present, on account of the commercial revulsion through which we have passed, besides the reliable facts presented in connection with our modified tariff laws which went into operation July 1st, 1857. Our trade, as exhibited by the imports and exports, has been highly satisfactory to all interests, and added another demonstration of the wisdom of that time-honored democratic policy which inculcates the least possible burdens of taxation consistent with an *economical* administration of the General Government. But it is not in reference to this branch of the subject that we propose at this time to dilate. We have another object, and one which we trust will be appreciated by all imbued with the spirit of that Constitution which was ordained and estab-

lished 'in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty' to its framers and their posterity. All those appeals which have heretofore admonished us—the patriots of the Revolution, the common suffering of our ancestors, our common toils and dangers, our common blessings and victories, the tombs of our statesmen and warriors, Mount Vernon, the Hermitage, and Ashland—all seem to have lost their power, and we are drifting to some unknown catastrophe, pregnant with every thing but safety.

"In view of these considerations, we have thought it not inappropriate to give the exports for the last fiscal year, as furnished by the different sections of the Republic, in the hope that our common interest, so signally displayed by these figures, will arrest that aggressive spirit which is hastening all to one undistinguished ruin.

"The exports of the last fiscal year, embracing specie and American produce, amounted to \$335,894,385; in addition to which we also exported something over twenty millions of foreign produce, making all of our exports above \$356,000,000, and exceeding our imports for the same period a fraction over \$18,000,000.

The specie and American produce exported were.....	\$335,894,385
Specie	57,502,305

The amount of produce consequently exported was ... 278,392,080

"We propose to classify the amount furnished by each

section as far as possible, by giving the amount furnished exclusively by the free States, the amount furnished by both the free and slave States, (it is impossible to separate and designate the respective amount furnished by each,) and the amount furnished exclusively by the slave States.

Free States exclusively—

Fisheries—embracing spermaceti and whale oils, dried and salt fish	\$4,462,974
Coal	653,536
Ice	164,581
Total free States.....	\$5,281,091

Free and slave States—

Products of the forest—embracing staves and headings, shingles, boards, plank, and scantling, hewn timber, other timber, oak bark and other dye, all manufactures of wood, ashes, ginseng, skins, and furs.....	12,099,967
---	------------

Product of agriculture—

Of animals—beef tallow, hides, horned cattle, butter, cheese, pork, hams and bacon, lard, wool, hogs, horses, mules, and sheep.....	15,549,817
---	------------

Vegetable food—

Wheat, flour, Indian corn, Indian meal, rye meal, rye, oats, and other small grain, and pulse, biscuit or shop bread, potatoes, apples, and onions.....	22,437,578
---	------------

Manufactures—

Refined sugar, wax, chocolate, spirits from grain, do. molasses, do. other materials, vinegar, beer, ale, porter and cider in casks and bottles, linseed oil, household furniture, carriages and parts, railroad cars and parts, hats of furs and silk, do. palm leaf, saddlery, trunks and valises, adamantine and other candles, soap, snuff, tobacco manufactured, gunpowder, leather, boots and shoes, cables and cordage, salt, lead, iron, pig, bar, nails, castings, and all manufactures of, copper, brass, and manufactures of, drugs and medicines, cotton piece goods, printed or

colored, white other than duck, duck and all manufactures of, hemp, thread, bags, cloth, and other manufactures of, wearing apparel, earthen and stone ware, combs and buttons, brooms and brushes of all kinds, billiard tables and apparatus, umbrellas, parasols and sunshades, morocco and other leather not sold by the pound, fire-engines, printing presses and type, musical instruments, books and maps, paper and stationery, paints and varnish, jewelry, other manufactures of gold and silver, glass, tin, pewter, and lead, marble and stone, bricks, lime, and cement, India-rubber shoes and manufactures, lard oils, oil cake, artificial flowers.....	\$30,197,274
Articles not enumerated, manufactured.....	2,274,652
Raw produce	1,858,205
Total, free and slave States	\$84,417,493

Slave States, exclusively—

Cotton.....	161,434,923
Tobacco	21,074,038
Rosin and turpentine	3,554,416
Rice.....	2,207,148
Tar and pitch.....	141,058
Brown sugar	196,935
Molasses.....	75,699
Hemp.....	9,279
Total, slave States	\$188,693,496

RECAPITULATION.

Free States, exclusively.....	5,281,091
Free and slave States	84,417,493
Slave States, exclusively	188,693,496
Total.....	\$278,392,080

“If any one will take the trouble to analyze the articles embraced in the amount of \$84,417,493, belonging alike to the labor of the free and slave States, he will find that at least one-third is as justly the products of slave labor.

We have, therefore, the fact that out of \$278,392,080 of exports of domestic industry, over \$200,000,000 of this sum is furnished by those States known as slave States."

We will now point out the folly of a comparison made by Helper between the northern hay and the southern cotton crops—of course disparaging to the latter. We will show that he grossly misrepresents the Census statement of 1850; and also show, that, even had his quotations been correct, the inferences he drew from the facts were perfectly ridiculous. Helper tells the public that the hay crop of 1850 was worth sixty-four millions of dollars more than the cotton crop of that year, or about twice the value of the latter. Now, Helper did not consider that the South, after supporting itself, sent away a large part of its cotton, for which the country—North as largely as the South—received a handsome return in desirable foreign products. He did not—of course he could not—show any export of hay to foreign ports. So that, one of three things, as regards the uses of this hay crop, is true: either the hay was consumed at home, toward the support of Northerners: or was shipped to the South; or was converted into beef and cattle for shipment to the South or to foreign countries.

If consumed at home, it cannot be allowed to make a figure in such a statement, for the Northerners, while consuming it, were doing no more than the Southerners while consuming their own products. When consumed, that was an end of it, just in the way an end was put to

the hog and hominy raised and consumed on the plantations of the South. If sent to the South, whether in the shape of hay or beef, the fact may be easily offset by the shipments to the North of cotton, rice and tobacco. If shipped abroad, the comparison is a just one. It is perfectly fair to compare the value of the hay shipped abroad with the cotton shipped abroad, because that is comparing surpluses with surpluses, or what each section has to spare after subsisting itself. Well, in 1852, the South sent away of cotton \$112,000,000; the same year the North and South sent away \$6,000,000 worth of "provisions," including as well the hog product as the cattle product. In 1859, the South sent away in cotton \$161,000,000; while the North and the South sent away fifteen millions of "provisions." This is the correct way of making the comparison. If one desired to show the comparative thriftiness of two merchants, he would compare their net earnings at the end of the year. He would not compare their gross earnings; since though it might be true that the gross earnings of one of them were much larger than those of the other, it might be true also that the expenses of the business, and of supporting its conductor had entirely absorbed those larger earnings, while the smaller could show a handsome balance after deducting all expenses.

We now proceed to another batch of Helper's statistics. His assumption is, that the average value of land in the South now is \$5.34 per acre. "Emancipate your slaves

on Wednesday morning, and on Thursday following the value of land will have increased to an average of \$28.07 per acre." Here is the table:

Estimated value of slaveholders' lands, after slavery shall have been abolished.....	\$4,856,783,680
Present value of slaveholders' lands	923,248,160
Probable aggregate enhancement of value.....	<u>\$3,933,535,520</u>

Having thus figured out or "marked up" the value of Southern lands, he presents another of his precious tables as follows:

Net increase of value which it is estimated will accrue to slaveholders in consequence of the abolition of slavery.....	\$3,933,535,520
Putative value of slaves.....	<u>1,600,000,000</u>
Slaveholders' estimated net landed profits of emancipation.....	\$2,333,535,520

Yes, set the slaves free on Wednesday night, and you will suddenly find yourselves next morning, at daylight, about five times richer than you were when you went to bed the night before. We need say nothing to expose the folly and stupidity of such a representation. It is a gross caricature of the whole learning of statistics.

Possibly, after sharing the experience of Jamaica, lands might rise in one hundred years, or say the lifetime of three generations, to the value he fixes on them. The present slaveholders or their descendants would not feel the rise, we may be pretty sure. But this consideration aside, let us see how the account would really stand, allow-

ing free swing to Helper's emancipation scheme. Here are our statistics, and we think they quite good enough for the occasion :

Net value of land (100 years hence) presuming	
Helper's rise.....	\$2,333,535,220
Exports of cotton this year, say \$200,000,000, would	
give for 100 years.....	20,000,000,000
	<hr/>
Dead loss to the South.....	\$17,666,464,780

Now look at Helper's figures, and then at ours.. Is not the contrast an awful one for a nervous man's contemplation? Over seventeen billions of hard dollars lost in consequence of heeding Helper! Nor is this the whole loss, for we have made no account of the rice, tobacco and naval stores exported from the South. But perhaps some Helperite, with due gravity, will object that we do not allow the South to export any thing after emancipation. The above calculation does not; and probably the South would have but little to export for a long while after such a catastrophe. But supposing the South in her altered state to export the same amount the North now does, we may take off one-third of the seventeen billions, and then be liberal to the other side. That deducted, the dead loss of the South would be *only* about *twelve billions*. We by no means desire to have it understood that we present our table as a specimen of the way in which statistics ought to be used. But as showing up the Helperian style of reaching results, and as a fair offset to his arithmetic, they answer our present purpose.

We have exposed the worthlessness of this publication in reference to the claim set up for it by its friends, that it is statistically valuable. Even Mr. Seward could bring himself to pronounce such a judgment upon it.

We might prolong our review with many reflections which these facts awaken. We might point to other facts connected with the subject to show the interested dependence of one section upon another, apart from the produce which each sends abroad. We might at some length and with some feeling portray the folly of continuing our dissensions and discords, as sections of this great Republic. But we forbear. We submit these figures and facts for those who think and are governed by reason, no matter where their lot has been cast, whether North or South, East or West.

Says Helper on the 16th page of the Compendium:—

“Too long have we yielded a submissive obedience to the tyrannical domination of an inflated oligarchy; too long have we tolerated their arrogance and self-conceit; too long have we submitted to their unjust and savage exactions. Let us now wrest from them the sceptre of power, establish liberty and equal rights throughout the land, and henceforth and forever guard our legislative halls from the pollutions and usurpations of pro-slavery demagogues.”

Will any true-hearted American own sympathy with such sentiments, or countenance, encourage and support the designs here avowed? Will not *Honest* Republicans pause and reflect upon the fearful tendency of this spirit

of sectionalism, and their duty as patriots and Christians, to aid in arresting it, ere it be too late—ere the Union is overthrown, and the light of American liberty is extinguished in blood and carnage, with the torch of civil war as our only beacon upon the dark sea of anarchy and ruin?

But, alas! we fear we are deceived as to the honesty of Republicans: their minds have become inflated against us, wrought so by the treasonable teachings of their “*leaders*.”

Can the North point out a single tyrannical act that the South has ever been guilty of? If you can, we are willing to acknowledge and confess it. Mr. Helper makes the assertion, but does not state how we have been “*tyrannical*.”

Republican factions at the North (for we have good reason to thank God that they do not exist South,) say that the “Democratic party” is a “slave-democracy.” If it be a “slave-democracy” because it is a national and conservative party, recognizing the South as having *as many rights in the Union* as the North, then the Northern people are to blame themselves, if they have “yielded a submissive obedience to the tyrannical domination of an inflated oligarchy,” because they have by their votes sustained it. By Mr. Helper’s own argument he shows that the Republican party is sectional. We know that the Democratic party is charged by the Republicans as being sectional. Now we will see which is the sectional and which is the national party; and, in doing so, we cannot do

better than quote an extract from a speech of the Hon. Horatio G. Seymore of New York, delivered on the 24th day of August, 1859, at St. Paul's, Minnesota, a man who has always distinguished himself by his patriotism, &c.

Said Mr. Seymore—"You have seen the great men of this Republican party go up to their National Conventions. When the roll of the States was called, there was no man to answer for the State where Jackson's ashes lie—there was no man to respond when the land of Sumpter and Marion was called. (Applause.) But how will it be when our next Democratic Convention is held? You will see there no such spectacle as this. When we call the roll of States which compose this confederacy, every commonwealth, from Maine down to young Minnesota, and still younger Oregon, will attest the nationality of our party by the presence of its representatives." (Cheers.)

Now, if the Democratic party have had to undergo some defeats, it is not because it was "*sectional*," but it has been in consequence of some mere local issue or fanaticism; for, when it triumphed over the Republican party in 1856, when that party made its first issue before the country, the Democratic party triumphed over its opponents and domestic traitors (Republicans) on sound constitutional principles.

Democracy possesses a vitality, a spirit of coherence which nothing can destroy. Stricken down in one place, it rises in another, and gathers, from the very circumstances of its defeat, new elements of vigor and success.

The reason of this is, it is a national constitutional party, and its members always think more of principles than of men.

Founded on the Constitution, it enters the contest with doctrines and principles the essence of truth, and which never fail to commend themselves in the end to the acceptance and approval of the people.

CHAPTER III.

Helper's Slanders on the Non-Slaveholding people of the South refuted—Better chance in the South for a poor man than in the North—The proofs—Names of prominent Statesmen of the South who have risen from poverty to the highest eminence—the Negro well treated in the South—Richly repaid for his Labor—Comparisons between the poor Whites of the North and the Negro of the South—The Strike of the poor Whites in Massachusetts—They admit that they are worse off than the Slaves in the South.

“IN the South, unfortunately, no kind of labor is either free or respectable. Every white man who is under the necessity of earning his bread by the sweat of his brow, or by manual labor in any capacity, no matter how unassuming in deportment or exemplary in morals, is treated as if he were a loathsome beast, and shunned with disdain. His soul may be the very seat of honor and integrity; yet, without slaves,—himself a slave,—he is accounted as nobody, and would be deemed intolerably presumptuous if he dared to open his mouth, even so wide as to give faint utterance to a three-lettered monosyllable, like yea or nay, in the presence of an august knight of the whip and the lash.”—Page 23.

There probably was never so gross a compilation of falsehoods so wantonly forced together as the foregoing extract embraces. It is these miserable exaggerations

and misrepresentations of the social relations of the Anglo-Saxons of the South which canker the minds and feelings of the Northern masses. There is no place on earth where the industrious, enterprising, and upright poor man—no matter what his calling—is more cordially aided and abetted in all his honorable undertakings than in the South, or slave-holding States. Why, it is honestly—when not suppressed by party prejudices—a Northern proverb, and a standing instruction to the poor, but enterprising young Northerner, “Go you to the sunny South, and there, amongst the generous and warm-hearted Southerners, work your way to fortune and fame.” The liberal aid which has been so frequently, freely, and unsuspectingly extended to the numberless hordes of Northern pedagogues, tin pedlers, pill vendors, etc., and which has often resulted in begetting them opulence and fame, has been most ungratefully received, and the success of their recipients attributed to the superior energy, talents, and enterprise of the Northerner over the Southerner. It is most lamentably true that the South thus, in many instances, warms in its genial bosom the malignant viper that strikes its poisonous sting to her vitals. The demagogue or the villain always taxes his ingenuity in manufacturing that species of specious argument which he thinks best calculated to induce those whom he designs to operate upon to think, feel, and act as he does. Such is the base resort of the abolitionist, and the meaner jealous opponent of African slavery. They attempt to fire the feelings of

the laboring class by appeals to their pride and personal independence; ignoring that natural sequence, that the ordinary mutations of life furnish in every location and latitude of this free country, daily evidences of the rich man becoming poor, and the poor man becoming rich; of the humble man mounting the ladder of fame, and he that was up, by the process of natural law passing down. Fame and fortune, intelligence and ignorance, are not governed in the slightest degree by the institution of African slavery: they seem to be the handiwork of another and superior power; or, if controlled solely by human agency, can be accounted for on quite different hypotheses. A comparative statement would show quite as many men of wealth, quite as many, too, going up and down the scale of fortune, quite as many enjoying fame, and they, too, passing up and down the elevator of circumstances, which contribute to put men in and out of power and place, at the South as there are at the North, and these mutations are not confined to any class or condition in life. The man of *will* works out his own position, and would no more, though poor, stand the lash of the arrogant Southerner, than he would the lock and key of the manufacturing nabob of the North.

The Northern tyrant, as he lords it over the poor white laborer, tasks him to the utmost of his physical capacity, requiring him to march to the task indicated for him with the precision of time; shrewdly names his imperious exactions "DISCIPLINE;" while the Southern disciplinarian is uncharitably denounced as being an arro-

gant, dogmatical, exacting "knight of the whip and the lash." Those invidious misnomers are the offspring of malignant minds, seeking to stir up strife and discord, creating imaginary distinctions; and, by the envy it inspires, produces serious breaches in otherwise more united communities.

There are many distinguished instances of the poor man, the mechanic, men of various vocations in life, who "earned their bread by the sweat of their brow" at the South, who have acquired wealth, high respectability, and wide-spread fame, as liberal and enlightened statesmen. We will take the liberty of giving the names of some of these living instances:—Honorable Messrs. Johnson, "Jimmie Jones," G. W. Jones, and Staunton of Tennessee, Staunton of Kentucky, Governors Letcher and McMullin of Virginia, Orr and Ashmore of South Carolina, Stephens, and Brown Governor of Georgia. The first of this galaxy of great and talented men in the South who have risen from the humble to the higher walks of life, and who is as much respected as any gentleman in our land, was in early life a tailor by trade, (his sign still hangs over his old shop door in the town where he lives, in Tennessee,) and, withal, the people of that Southern State respect him enough to honor him with a seat in the United States Senate. "Jimmie Jones" was a blacksmith, and his stalwart blows were honored with high State and National positions. Geo. W. Jones is a saddler by trade; the Stauntons are bricklayers; Letcher a house

carpenter; McMullen was a wagoner; Stephens was physically incapable of labor, but was poor, and had to work his way to position as best he could. The present Governor of Georgia was of very obscure origin. Orr was poor, and Ashmore was unlearned and penniless, until by the dint of his own labor he acquired means and education. The commanding talents and honored positions of the gentlemen above named are well known to every intelligent reader in the United States; and they are *native* Southerners, poor boys, laboring men, yet honored! Is this truth or fiction, Mr. Helper? How do those living facts comport with your malicious slanders, "that no kind of labor is either free or respected at the South"?

The traitor is generally hired to perform his treason, consequently but little respect is ever paid to his acts, and they are never based upon sound principle. Helper's statistics are shown to be false, and his reasoning,—and that also of his entire abolition cohorts,—is fallacious; they first assert that the poor man, the laboring man, the mechanic, at the South, is not respected, is not allowed the privilege of expressing a monosyllable in the presence of one of the "knights of the lash and the whip." Per contrary, they assert that slavery begets arrogance, indolence, degeneracy, and want of enterprise upon the part of the slaveholder, and he consequently loses his wealth and self-respect, and that the enterprising laboring man soon supplants him. Now, the truth is, these assertions are all manufactured for hellish purposes—to array class

against class at the South, and, at the North, to excite a false and uncalled for sympathy for the laboring whites at the South, and to engender hatred towards the slave owners. We shall never degrade the white man, by any parity of reasoning, to social or political equality with the negro,—but there are practical questions which involve the means of temporal existence and happiness, where we think a comparison of the condition of the races may be introduced happily, to quiet the nervous anxiety of many about the condition of the poor negro. At the South, the negro is richly rewarded for his labor, by being most abundantly provided for with clothing, food, nursing when sick, for himself and family,—this, too, without racking care and ceaseless anxiety; as evidenced by the poor white man, whose daily and even nightly labors frequently are inadequate to secure honestly the necessaries of life for himself and family; in proof of which, we submit the acknowledgment of the Lynn strikers.

THE STRIKE AT LYNN.

From the Boston Traveler, Feb. 23.

Most of the company, during the time intervening between the hour at which they began to assemble and that at which they were to co-operate in a demonstration, divided up in little knots, and engaged in conversation with each other, instead of occupying themselves with more irregular proceedings. Some of these conversations merged into discussions, and oftentimes became quite exciting, at-

tracting the attention of such outsiders as could not help overhearing them.

Among the crowd I noticed two intelligent shoemakers, who were deep in argument, pro and con, on a question relating to the merits of the case, and had attracted several hundred people to hear their discussion.

"What is the use," said one of them, who seemed to take an interest in politics, "of our making such a fuss about the slaves of the South? I tell you, we are almost as much oppressed as they are. In fact, in one sense we are worse oppressed, for they don't work so many hours in a week as we do, and they get a living, while most of us couldn't live, with our families, if we couldn't get trusted for necessities of life, which we never expect to be able to pay for at this rate."

His opponent seemed to hesitate, and a bystander put in, "We are worse treated than the slaves of the South, in every sense, so far as I can see."

"Yes," said the first speaker, "I don't know but we are."

The second party to the controversy now spoke up with some earnestness:—"You know, gentlemen, we are not a quarter as bad off as the slaves of the South, though we are, by our —— foolishness, ten times as bad off as we ought to be. They can't vote, nor complain, and we can. And, then, just think of it. The slaves can't hold mass meetings, nor 'strike,' and we hav'n't lost that privilege yet, thank the Lord!" (Loud cheers.)

First Speaker.—That's so ; but what'll those privileges amount to, if they come to nothing? You see, gentlemen, the only superiority of our condition over that of Southern slaves is, we have got to manufacture ourselves out of this strike. (Cheers.) Shall we fail, or shall we assert our superiority over Southern niggers? (Prolonged cheers—cries of “We'll never fail—We'll starve to death first.”)

Another conversation between a “boss” and two of his employees, among the strikers, was more laconic and less respectful—

Boss—“Good morning, gentlemen.”

First Jour.—“Good morning, sir. I guess you begin to think we are in earnest?”

Second Jour.—“How are ye? Wall, don't you think the bosses 'll have to knock under (excitedly), and use us decent?”

Boss—“Hav'n't I always used you decent?”

First Jour.—“Do you think \$250 enough for a man with a family to live on?”

Second Jour.—“No, you know you hav'n't used us decent, and we'll show you how to do it, too!”

Boss—“I have always paid all I could afford to.”

Second Jour.—“You hav'n't.”

Boss—“I have.”

Second Jour.—“You lie, and you know it.”

Boss—It's no use trying to argue with a fool!” (Exit.)

Second Jour. (somewhat maliciously)—“We'll show you

whose's a fool and who ain't, before we get through with it."

Would it be proper or right, would it be in good taste or generous sentiment, for the people of the South to advise this conflict of action between the *labor and capital* of the North? Would it be philanthropic or Christian-like in them to stimulate the *white employees* to plunder and murder their employers?

CHAPTER IV.

The Hypocrisy of Helper—In favor of Slavery in his work issued 1855—Driven from the South for stealing three hundred dollars—Writes “Helper’s Impending Crisis of the South”—Helper denounces free negroes in his “Land of Gold”—Valuable statistical information in regard to the power and wealth of the South—Seaports of the South—Shore line of States on the Atlantic Ocean in favor of the South, of eighteen thousand miles more than the North—The power of the South to establish and maintain a separate and independent government against the United North combined—The military strength of the South estimated at six million whites—Her immense resources in case of war.

“Two hundred and thirty-nine years have the negroes in America been held in *inhuman* bondage. During the whole of this long period they have toiled unceasingly, from the gray of dawn till the dusk of eve, for their *cruel* taskmasters, who have rewarded them with scanty allowances of the most inferior qualities of victuals and clothes, with heartless separations of the tenderest ties of kindred, with epithets, with scoldings, with execrations, and with the lash—and, not unfrequently, with the fatal bludgeon, or the more deadly weapon.” (Page 87, Comp.)

It is very strange indeed, that after the lapse of only six years, Mr. Helper’s mind should take so great a change. We intend to show that Mr. Helper, when making use of the above language, contradicts what he

said in a book published in 1855. It is very strange that Mr. Helper would make use of the following, which he published in a book entitled "The Land of Gold," published, as I have before stated, in the year 1855, at Baltimore, "by Henry Taylor, Sun Iron Building."

On pages 275-6-7-8-9, about the middle of page 275, near the top of the page, the writer says thus:—"There are comparatively few negroes in this new State (California). Most of those who are found here, have emigrated from the Northern and Eastern States in the capacity of cooks and stewards of vessels. They are in the same situation as their brethren in New York and Massachusetts, *slaves to no single individual, but to the entire community*. Like free negroes everywhere else, they inhabit the worst parts of the towns in California, and live commonly in characteristic *filth and degradation*. There are a few blacks from the South, and these have been brought out here as slaves. It is true that on their arrival here, they have the power of claiming their freedom; *but such is their attachment to their masters, that this is rarely done*. Instances have occurred in which they have been enticed away by *meddling abolitionists*; but, disgusted with a freedom which was of no value to them, they have been *eager to return* again to their masters. Several cases of this kind have come under my own observation.

"I was personally acquainted with a New Orleans sea-captain and shipowner, who had a very likely negro man named Joe. This slave had acted as his special servant

for many years, and had made two or three voyages with him between Shanghai and San Francisco. His conduct was entirely unobjectionable, and his duties were always promptly and efficiently discharged. Indeed, the captain informed me that, though he had reared Joe, he never had occasion to whip him for any offense. Others had observed the admirable traits of the negro, and several persons had attempted to buy him, offering extraordinary prices; but his master, having the highest appreciation of his qualities and a strong personal attachment for him, positively refused to part with him on any terms. At last, however, Joe deserted the vessel. An abolitionist had persuaded him to leave his master; and a short while thereafter he married a Mexican woman—a sort of half-breed—and went off to the mines, near Campo Seco. But he found his freedom unprofitable and troublesome. While in his legitimate station he had always had an easy time, plenty of food and an abundance of clothing. He had also accumulated two or three hundred dollars, which had been given him by his master and others for extra services. Not long after his marriage with the Mexican woman, his money disappeared; he became penniless, ragged, dejected, and, as a last resort, determined to return to San Francisco, beg his master's pardon, and, if possible, reinstate himself in the favor of one who had always been his friend. He did return, presented himself as a suppliant before his master, told him that he had been persuaded to leave, that he was sorry for having

done so, and now wished to enter his service again, promising unwavering faithfulness in the future. The master regarded him with a steady gaze until he had finished his story, and then, in a distinct and dispassionate tone, said to him: 'You had no cause for leaving me; I had always treated you well; now you may go, I don't want you any longer.' At the conclusion of these words, the negro dropped in despair at his master's feet, and wept like a child. Moved by the sincerity of the negro's repentance, and having duly considered the extenuating circumstances of the case, the master overlooked his estrangement, set him to work and never had the least difficulty with him afterward. Of his *Dulcina*, whom it seems he had married in a Laguna dance-house, I know nothing, except the information I gained from Joe himself, that she left him as soon as his money was gone.

"One more instance, and I have done with the negroes. A gentleman, and three of his slaves, from the western part of North Carolina, had been mining about two years, near Quartzburg, in Mariposa County. Their efforts having been crowned with success, the master concluded to return home, and, speaking to his slaves of his intention, he told them that they were at liberty to remain in California, where their freedom would not be disturbed, and where they would be entitled to the entire proceeds of their labor. To this they replied that the abolitionists had told them that long before, and, after detailing several attempts to decoy them from their owner, and signifying

their unwillingness to remain in California, they concluded by requesting their master to take them with him. He consented, paid their passage, and they all returned home in the same vessel.

“The applicability of slave labor to the soil of Southern California is now becoming a theme of discussion in that region, and it is probable that the experiment will one day be tried. Indeed, the propriety of dividing the State into Northern and Southern California has already occupied the attention of the legislature; and, while it is generally admitted that the people are about equally divided upon the measure, it is universally conceded that, in case of its adoption, the Southern portion will establish the laws and institutions of Virginia and Louisiana.”

The writer also says, on page 221 of the same book, in relation to Nicaragua, and its future, as follows:—

“*Nicaragua can never fulfill its destiny until it introduces negro slavery. Nothing but slave labor can ever subdue its forests or cultivate its untimbered lands. White men may live upon its soil, with an umbrella in one hand and a fan in the other; but they can never unfold or develop its resources.* May we not safely conclude that negro slavery will be introduced into this country before the lapse of many years? We think so. The *tendency* of events fully warrants this inference.” Page 221 Land of Gold.

“Oh, Consistency, thou art a jewel!”

The question has often been asked, What are the capa-

bilities of the South? 'Upon this point we ask to be heard with attention. We have, already, an immense line of railroad, and an equally extensive line of steamboats in successful operation, and thousands of miles more projected. We have capacious ports and harbors strung along the Atlantic coast from the Gulf of Mexico to the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays, including sounds and rivers to head of tide, amounting to 23,803 miles, and more than *doubling* those of the North, of which Helper now delights to boast! Our inland water communications are unequalled. Look at the following tables, and tell us, does the South lack facilities for commercial intercourse? And any person who has witnessed the proceedings of the various legislatures of the Southern States, will see that they have passed bills for their improvement, and are establishing lines of steamboats between them and foreign ports.

Tables showing the shore line of States on the Atlantic coast and Gulf of Mexico.

NORTHERN STATES.

	Shore line of coast washed by sea.	Shore line of coast washed by bays, sounds, &c.	Shore line of rivers to the head of tide.	Total sea coast, and shores of bays, sounds, &c.	Total sea coast, and shores of bays, sounds, &c. and of rivers to head of tide.
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Maine.....	427	1,599	427	2,026	2,453
New Hampshire.....	13	37	24	50	74
Massachusetts.....	209	865	832	1,074	1,906
Rhode Island.....	55	153	232	208	440
Connecticut.....	14	239	1,074	253	1,327
New York.....	114	886	1,057	1,000	2,057
New Jersey.....	118	702	151	820	971
Pennsylvania.....			106		106

Total Northern, Miles.....9,334

SOUTHERN STATES.

	Shore line of coast washed by sea.	Shore line of coast washed by bays, sounds, &c.	Shore line of rivers to the head of tide.	Total sea coast, and shores of bays, sounds, &c.	Total sea coast, and shores of bays, sounds, &c., and of rivers to head of tide.
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Delaware.....	29	136	506	165	671
Maryland.....	44	1,008	3,401	1,052	4,453
Virginia.....	148	735	1,690	883	2,573
North Carolina.....	299	1,549	932	1,848	2,780
South Carolina.....	192	356	708	548	1,256
Georgia.....	76	410	468	486	954
Florida.....	1,020	3,005	860	4,025	4,885
Alabama.....	33	284	313	317	630
Mississippi.....	42	206	137	248	385
Louisiana.....	616	1,595	936	2,211	3,147
Texas.....	353	1,284	432	1,637	2,069

Total Southern, Miles.....23,803

Number of harbors in the different States on the coast, and the principal ones on rivers to the head of tide. (Incomplete.)

STATES. (NORTHERN.)	Number of harbors (not including all upon rivers).
Maine.....	52
New Hampshire.....	3
Massachusetts.....	51
Rhode Island.....	7
Connecticut.....	32
New York.....	27
New Jersey.....	14
Pennsylvania.....	3

Total.....189

STATES. (SOUTHERN.)	Number of harbors (not including all upon rivers)
Delaware.....	3
Maryland.....	11
Virginia.....	22
North Carolina.....	52
South Carolina.....	21
Georgia.....	15
Florida.....	66
Alabama.....	4
Mississippi.....	10
Louisiana.....	33
Texas.....	12

Total.....249

The table of harbors is incomplete, but the full table will only increase the number of those of the South, and show her still greater relative superiority. With railroads and rivers traversing every portion of her territory,—with safe and ample harbors indenting her coasts, and with thousands of miles of her shores washed by the ocean, what does the South lack in the way of facilities for transportation? Nothing, literally. If, then, the South shall be forced to establish a separate and independent government, by the continual aggressions of the North, would her geographical position shut her out from intercourse with the world? No! verily, she is throughout her whole extent, by the act of God, in contract with the commercial world.

Our coal and iron, copper, lead, zinc, and other valuable minerals, are exhaustless; and the produce of an empire can now most readily be entered at any port in the South.

But with us, in the South, "Cotton is King;" and, in the language of Prof. De Bow, "It is the cotton-bale that makes the treaties of the world, and binds over the nations to keep the peace."

Behind the cotton-bale, in time of war, our armies take shelter, while in time of peace our cotton-bales employ the shipping of at least half the American commerce, feed the looms and spindles of the entire North, adding to all the wealth and opulence enjoyed by their great marts. And while we enjoy the right of Hamatic servitude *guaranteed to us by the Constitution of our country*, and by the *Di-*

vine laws of God, with our superior soil and genial climate, no competition on earth will be able to stand before us.

And these rights we intend to enjoy, or to a man we will die, strung along Mason & Dixon's line, with our faces looking North. Leave us in the peaceable possession of our slaves, and our Northern neighbors may have all the paupers and convicts that pour in upon us from European prisons, the getters up of "hunger meetings" at the North, and the propagators of the most irreligious and impious "isms" of the day. The productive wealth of the South, her agricultural and mineral resources, her population and extent of territory, are greatly underrated by the politicians of the North, and the reckless agitators of the slavery question, such as Seward, Chase, Giddings & Co. There are nine hundred and twenty-nine thousand square miles in the South,—an area as large as that covered by Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Spain. The North, even after the admission of the two large territories of Kansas and Minnesota, will fall more than one hundred thousand square miles short of the South. This does not include the territory west of the Rocky Mountains, which will never come in antagonism with the South. There are 12,000,000 of inhabitants in the slaveholding States of this Union, and of this number 4,000,000 are slaves; and their aggregate value, at present prices, will amount to \$170,000,000. This item of Southern wealth Helper left out of his calculations, or willfully lied. This gives us an aggregate population larger than that of Great

Britain when she struggled against Napoleon and the combined armies of Europe.

The population of the slaveholding States of this Confederacy is five times that of the united Continental Colonies. It is three times that of Sweden and Norway, and greater than that of Belgium, Portugal, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, and Greece combined. We have a population five times as large as that which conquered our independence, and a thousand-fold as strong. We have 1,000,000 of men upon our muster-rolls. At any time, upon short notice, the South can raise, equip, and maintain in the field, a larger force than any power on earth can send against her: men, too, brought up on horseback and in active life, with guns in their hands,—men who will not *desert* their colors, as some of the Northern men have done in Mexico and elsewhere!

NOTE.—Helper stole three hundred dollars from his employer, a bookseller at Raleigh, North Carolina, and fled from the South.

CHAPTER V.

Helper's ignorance of the feelings of the non-slaveholding population of the South to their country—The negroes of the South true to their masters—The proofs given at Harper's Ferry—Not a slave attempted to run away—The South have no fears of the uprising of the negroes—How the negroes aided their masters to repel the British under Lord Cornwallis, and at New Orleans—Report of the Virginia Legislature on the Harper's Ferry outrage.

“HENCEFORTH, sirs, we are demandants, not suppliants. We demand our rights, nothing more, nothing less. It is for you to decide whether we are to have justice peaceably or by violence, for whatever consequences may follow, we are determined to have it one way or the other. Do you aspire to become the victims of white *non-slaveholding* vengeance by day, and of barbarous massacre by the negroes at night? Would you be instrumental in bringing upon yourselves, your wives, and your children, a fate too horrible to contemplate? Shall history cease to cite as an instance of unexampled cruelty, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, because the world—the South—shall have furnished a more direful scene of atrocity and carnage?”
—*Helper's Book*, page 128.

Such are the incendiary words put forth by this miserable *scamp*—Helper—and endorsed by sixty-eight mem-

bers of Congress. We think that Mr. Helper must have intended to put a part of the above in another work he was writing in *defense* of the South, and *advocating slave extension as he did in his "Land of Gold;"** but who being detected in stealing, was cut short in writing it by having to leave the State or go to prison. Mr. Helper professes to be a native of the South; but we are of opinion that Southern soil never gave birth to so great a liar and rascal. And yet he says (pretending to have a great deal of knowledge of the South) that we will "become the victims of white non-slaveholding vengeance by day, and of barbarous massacre by the negroes at night." On page 148 of his work, Helper fixes the number of slaveholders at 186,551, and the non-slaveholders at 824 603, leaving a majority in favor of the non-slaveholders, thus giving them the power to control us. In their hands lie the perpetuity of slavery, and if the non-slaveholders at the South were to close their hands on us, the institution of slavery would be eternally crushed out. But we have never heard that portion of our community complain of the institution of slavery as a curse, never have they complained of the loss of a single right; but, on the contrary, they are the warmest supporters that the institution of slavery has.

We can assure Mr. Helper and his followers (the "Black" Republicans) that we have no fear for our safety

* Mr. Helper wrote a work in 1855, entitled, "The Land of Gold," that advocated the extension of slavery.

from the so-called "vengeance of the non-slaveholders by day, and of barbarous massacre by the negroes at night." We have no such fears. But we are of opinion that this man Helper has very much overrated himself and laid the above (as we believe he thinks) "*flattering* unction to his soul," which will never be fulfilled, for "John Brown" attempted to carry out a part of the platform as laid down in the book of this traitor, thief, and liar, viz.: "What our noble sires of the Revolution left unfinished, it is our duty to complete," page 95. "John Brown" labored under the same blind and fatal belief that the non-slaveholding whites and the free negroes, together with the slaves, would rise on a moment's warning, and murder, rob, and burn all in the name of *Freedom*.

But alas! this poor, miserable, deluded wretch was doomed to meet a sad end. He found that the non-slaveholders and the free negroes, together with the slaves, would not rise in rebellion, and murder their masters. But John Brown, when he found this out it was too late to make amends, fought the harder to effect his escape; but failed, was tried, found guilty after a full and fair trial, and hung together with his confederates.

For the history of the manner in which the slave population behaved during the excitement at Harper's Ferry at a time, if they chose, they could have obtained their *freedom*, we would refer the reader to the following extracts from the "Report of the Joint Committee of the

General Assembly of Virginia on the Harper's Ferry Outrage, January 26th, 1860, Doc. No. XXXI., which also contains some useful as well as valuable information on the slavery question, and we offer it without comment. It speaks for itself:—

“During the first night of the attack, and before the citizens of the town were apprized of the danger, a band of the conspirators, among whom were Cook and Hazlitt, were sent to the rendezvous in Maryland, with wagons and teams, and several slaves whom they had pressed into service, to bring off the rifles, pistols, and pikes which had been collected at that point. But when they received information of the condition of their confederates at Harper's Ferry, they abandoned their purpose and fled to the mountains, and made their escape. The slaves availed themselves of the first opportunity to return to their masters, and a body of troops, sent for that purpose, visited the rendezvous and brought off the wagons and arms.

“But, in the opinion of your committee, this is but a single and comparatively unimportant chapter in the history of this outrage. They would cheerfully have undertaken the task of investigating the subject, in all its relations and ramifications, if they had possessed the power to compel the attendance of witnesses who reside beyond the limits of the Commonwealth; but having no such power, they are constrained to leave that branch of the investigation in the hands of the committee of the Senate of the United States. Your committee have no hesitation, how-

ever, in expressing the opinion, from the evidence before them, that many others besides the parties directly engaged in the raid at Harper's Ferry, are deeply implicated, as aiders and abettors, and accessories before the fact, with full knowledge of the guilty purposes of their confederates. Some of these, like Gerrit Smith of New York, Dr. S. G. Howe of Boston, ——— Sanborn, and Thaddeus Hyatt of New York, and probably others, are represented to have held respectable positions in society; but whatever may have been their social standing heretofore, they must henceforth, in the esteem of all good men, be branded as the guilty confederates of thieves, murderers and traitors.

“The evidence before your committee is sufficient to show the existence, in a number of Northern States, of a wide-spread conspiracy, not merely against Virginia, but against the peace and security of all the Southern States. But the careful erasure of names and dates from many of the papers found in Brown's possession, renders it difficult to procure legal evidence of the guilt of the parties implicated. The conviction of the existence of such a conspiracy is deepened by the sympathy with the culprits which has been manifested by large numbers of persons in the Northern States, and by the disposition which your committee are satisfied did exist, to rescue them from the custody of the law.

“Near five hundred letters, addressed to Governor Wise, after the arrest of Brown and his confederates, have been inspected by your committee. Many of these were anony-

mous, and evidently written in bad faith; but the greater number were genuine letters, apparently from respectable sources. In some instances, the authors professed to state from their own knowledge; and in others, from information which they credited, that there were organizations on foot, in various States and neighborhoods, to effect the rescue of Brown and his associates; and they therefore urged the Governor to concentrate a sufficient military force about Charlestown (the county seat of Jefferson) to frustrate all such purposes. Several ministers of the gospel, and other citizens, who valued the peace and harmony of the country, appealed to Governor Wise, as a measure of humanity, and to save the effusion of blood, to assemble such a body of troops around the prison as would intimidate the sympathizers from attempting a rescue. They justly foresaw that even an abortive attempt, attended with loss of life, would, in all probability, be followed by disastrous consequences to the peace of the country.

“Pending the trials, and after the conviction of the prisoners, a great many letters were received by the Governor from citizens of Northern States, urging him to pardon the offenders, or to commute their punishment. Some of them were written in a spirit of menace, threatening his life, and that of members of his family, if he should fail to comply with their demands. Others gave notice of the purpose of resolute bands of desperadoes to fire the principal towns and cities of Virginia, and thus obtain revenge by destroying the property and lives of our citizens.

Others appealed to his clemency, to his magnanimity, and to his hopes of future political promotion, as presenting motives for his intervention in behalf of the convicted felons. Another class (and among these were letters from men of national reputation) besought him to pardon them on the ground of public policy. The writers professed to be thoroughly informed as to the condition of public sentiment in the North, and represented it as so favorable to the pardon or commutation of punishment of the prisoners, as to render it highly expedient, if not necessary, to interpose the Executive prerogative of mercy, to conciliate this morbid popular opinion in the North.

“This invasion of a sovereign State by citizens of other States, confederated with subjects of a foreign government, presents matter for grave consideration. It is an event without a parallel in the history of our country. And when we remember that the incursion was marked by distinct geographical features—that it was made by citizens of Northern States on a Southern State—that all the countenance and encouragement which it received, and all the material aid which was extended to it, were by citizens of Northern States, and that its avowed object was to make war upon and overthrow an institution intimately interwoven with all the interests of the Southern States, and constituting an essential element of their social and political systems—an institution which has existed in Virginia for more than two centuries, and which is recognized and guaranteed by the mutual covenants between the

North and the South, embodied in the Constitution of the United States—every thoughtful mind must be filled with deep concern and anxiety for the future peace and security of the country.

“The subject of slavery has, from time to time, constituted a disturbing element in our political system, from the foundation of our confederated republic. At the date of the declaration of our national independence, slavery existed in every colony of the confederation. It had been introduced by the mother country, against the wishes and remonstrances of the colonies. It is true that in the more Northern members of the confederation the number of slaves was small; but the institution was recognized and protected by the laws of all the colonies. If, then, there be any thing in the institution of slavery at war with the laws of God or the rights of humanity, (which we deny,) the sin attaches to Great Britain as its founder, and to all the original thirteen States of the confederacy, as having given to it their sanction and support.

“Shortly after the Declaration of Independence, the Northern States adopted prospective measures to relieve themselves of the African population. But it is a great mistake to suppose that their policy, in this particular, was prompted by any spirit of philanthropy or tender regard for the welfare of the negro race. On the contrary, it was dictated by an enlightened self-interest, yielding obedience to overruling laws of social economy. Experience had shown that the African race were not adapted to high

Northern latitudes, and that slave labor could not compete successfully with free white labor in those pursuits to which the industry of the North was directed. This discovery having been made, the people of the North, at an early day, began to dispose of their slaves by sale to citizens of the Southern States, whose soil, climate, and productions were better adapted to their habits and capacities; and the legislation of the Northern States, following the course of public opinion, was directed not to emancipation, but to the removal of the slave population beyond their limits. To effect this object, they adopted a system of laws which provided, prospectively, that all children born of female slaves, within their jurisdiction, after certain specified dates, should be held free when they attained a given age. No law can be found on the statute book of any Northern State, which conferred the boon of freedom on a single slave in being. All who were slaves remained slaves. Freedom was secured only to the children of slaves, born after the days designated in the laws; and it was secured to them only in the contingency that the owner of the female slave should retain her within the jurisdiction of the State until after the child was born. To secure freedom to the afterborn child, therefore, it was necessary that the consent of the master, indicated by his permitting the mother to remain in the State, should be superadded to the provisions of the law. Without such consent the law would have been inoperative, because the mother, before the birth of the child, might, at the will of the master,

be removed beyond the jurisdiction of the law. There was no legal prohibition of such removal, for such a prohibition would have been at war with the policy of the law, which was obviously removal and not emancipation. The effect of this legislation was, as might have readily been foreseen, to induce the owners of female slaves to sell them to the planters of the South before the time arrived when the forfeiture of the offspring would accrue. By these laws a wholesale slave trade was inaugurated, under which a large proportion of the slaves of the Northern States were sold to persons residing south of Pennsylvania; and it is an unquestionable fact, that a large number of the slaves of the Southern States are the descendants of those sold by Northern men to citizens of the South, with covenants of general warranty of title to them and their increase.

“As early as 1778, Virginia, foreseeing the influx of slaves from the North, under the operation of natural causes and of anticipated legislation, sought to guard herself against its effects by stringent prohibitory enactments. With this view, in that year, she passed a law forbidding the importation of slaves into Virginia by land or sea, under penalty of £1,000 for each slave so imported, and the forfeiture of the right to the slave. The only exceptions made by the law, were in favor of *bona fide* immigrants bringing their slaves with them, and persons acquiring title to slaves in other States by descent, devise, or marriage. See 9 Hen. Stat. 471-2. This law remained

in force until the revisal of 1819, when it was dropped from the Code as unnecessary.

“In the more Northern States, slavery ceased to exist shortly after the Revolution. As early as 1774, it was provided by law in Rhode Island that all the offspring of female slaves born after 1784 should be free. Under the influence of natural causes, it also became practically extinct, about the date of the Revolution, in Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. A few slaves, however, lingered in those States until after the adoption of their respective constitutions, when, under the operation of their declarations of rights, those who thought proper to assert a claim to freedom obtained it. The judicial decision of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, by which slavery in that State became extinct, was pronounced in the case of *Littleton v. Tuttle*, in 1796. Chief Justice Parsons, in delivering the opinion of the Court in *Winchedon v. Hatfield*, 4 Mass. R. 127, says, ‘Slavery was introduced into this country soon after its first settlement, and was tolerated until the ratification of the present Constitution, (2d March, 1780.) The slave was the property of his master, subject to his orders, to reasonable correction for misbehavior, was transferable like a chattel by gift or sale, and was assets in the hands of his executor or administrator. If the master was guilty of a cruel or unreasonable castigation of his slave, he was liable to be punished for a breach of the peace, and I believe the slave was allowed to demand sureties of the peace from a

violent and barbarous master,—which generally caused a sale to another master. And the issue of the female slave, according to the maxim of the civil law, was the property of her master. Under these regulations, the treatment of slaves was in general mild and humane, and they suffered hardships not greater than hired servants.' "

Notwithstanding the Massachusetts Declaration of Rights in 1780, slavery seems to have continued for some years in that State. The following brief report of the case of *Littleton v. Tuttle* is appended to Judge Parsons' opinion in the case of *Winchedon v. Hatfield*:—

“ ‘ This was an action of assumpsit for money expended by the plaintiffs for the support and maintenance of Jacob, alias Cato, a negro and a pauper. Upon the general issue pleaded, the following facts were proved to the jury : Cato's father, named Scipio, was reputed a negro slave when Cato was born, and, according to the then general usage and opinion, was the property of Nathan Chase, an inhabitant of Littleton. Cato's mother, named Violet, was a negro in the same reputed condition, and the property of Joseph Harwood. Scipio and Violet were lawfully married and had issue, Cato, who was born in Littleton, January 18th, 1773, and was there, in the general opinion, a slave, the property of the said Harwood, as the owner of his mother. Harwood, on the 17th February, 1779, sold him to the defendant (Tuttle), who retained him in his service until he was 21 years old. He being then a cripple and unable to labor, the defendant delivered him to the overseers of

the poor of Littleton, and left him with them, refusing to make any provision for him; whereupon the overseers expended the money in his maintenance for which this action was brought.

“ ‘The court stopped the defendant’s counsel from replying, and the chief justice charged the jury, as the unanimous opinion of the court, that Cato, being born in this country, was born free, and that the defendant was not chargeable for his support after he was 21 years of age.’ ”

“It thus appears that slavery ceased to exist in Massachusetts, not by legislative action, but by the operation of a judicial decision rendered in 1796, by which a construction was placed on certain provisions of her Declaration of Rights, which is very different from the interpretation which similar provisions have received in other parts of the confederacy. The clause referred to is in these words: ‘All men are born free and equal, and have certain natural, essential and unalienable rights; among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; and that of acquiring, possessing and protecting property; in fine, that of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness.’ It is obvious, also, that this provision of the Declaration of Rights could not have been regarded as necessarily conferring the right to freedom on the slave population; for if such had been the opinion generally entertained, it would not have remained inoperative for sixteen years.

“Pennsylvania passed her first act for the removal of slavery 1st March, 1780—New Jersey in 1784—Connecticut in 1784, and New York in 1788; but these laws were very gradual in their operation, for the Census tables disclose the fact that in 1790 there were 158 slaves in New Hampshire and 17 in Vermont, and much larger numbers in the other States. As late as 1830 there were slaves in every New England State except Vermont.

“It thus appears that each State has claimed and exercised the right to regulate its own domestic institutions, according to its own pleasure, without let or hindrance from the other States.

“At the time the federal Constitution was adopted, the whole number of slaves, in all the States north of Delaware, was 40,370, of whom three-fourths were found in New York and New Jersey, and it was well known to every one, that in a few years the institution would cease to exist in all the Northern States.

“At this date, the African slave trade existed in full vigor, and the importation of slaves into some of the States was tolerated, whilst in others it was strictly prohibited under heavy penalties.

“When, in pursuance of the invitation given by Virginia to her sister States, to send delegates to a convention, to form a more perfect Union, that body assembled, these diversities in the institutions and interests of the Northern and Southern States, which it was foreseen would tend progressively to increase, naturally attracted atten-

tion, and were the subject of grave and anxious deliberation.

The first form in which the slavery question presented itself to the framers of the Constitution, was in regard to the relation of the slave population to taxation and representation. This question was adjusted without much debate, to the satisfaction of all parties, in conformity with the rule previously established in the Continental Congress, by a compromise, which stipulated that three-fifths of the slave-population should be counted in establishing the ratio of representation, and in the imposition of direct taxes. The vote by States on this proposition stood: Ayes—Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia—9. Nays—New Jersey and Delaware—2. Elliott's Debates, vol. 1, p. 203.

“The next aspect in which the subject arose was in regard to the suppression of the African slave trade; and here again the subject of difference was settled in a wise spirit of conciliation and mutual concession.

“The proposition originally reported to the convention was in these words: ‘The migration or importation of such persons as the several States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Legislature prior to the year 1800, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such migration or importation at a rate not exceeding the average of the duties levied on imports.’ Elliott's Debates, vol. 1, p. 292. On the 25th of August, 1787, it

was moved to amend the report, by striking out the words 'the year eighteen hundred,' and inserting the words, 'the year eighteen hundred and eight,' which passed in the affirmative: Yeas—New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia—7. Nays—New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Virginia—4. Rhode Island and New York did not vote on the question. Thus it appears that New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut voted to prolong the period during which the slave trade should be allowed.

"On the question to agree to the first part of the report as amended, viz: 'The migration or importation of such persons as the several States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Legislature prior to the year 1808,' it passed in the affirmative: Yeas—New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia—7. Nays—New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Virginia—4. Elliott's Debates, vol. 1, pp. 295-6.

"The course of Virginia on this subject, it is well known, was dictated by no friendly feeling to the African slave trade. She had prohibited it by her own laws as early as 1778, and George Mason, one of her delegates to the federal convention, refused to give his sanction to the Constitution, among other reasons, because it failed to place an immediate interdict on the African trade.

"The third and last form in which the subject of slavery

was considered by the convention, was in reference to the surrender of fugitive slaves. The provision on this subject came up for consideration on the 29th of August, 1787. It was in these words: 'If any person be bound to service or labor in any part of the United States, and shall escape into another State, he or she shall not be discharged from such service or labor, in consequence of any regulation subsisting in the State to which they shall escape, but shall be delivered up to the person justly claiming their service or labor.'

"The propriety and justice of this provision were so obvious, that it was adopted by the unanimous vote of the convention. Elliott's Debates, vol. 1, p. 303.

"Your committee have thus reviewed the history of all the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, which have a direct bearing on the subject of slavery, and it will be seen that on every point they are of the most distinct and imperative character. They are in the nature of formal covenants. These covenants constituted the consideration for which the Southern States agreed to make concessions on their part, intended for the public good. Without these covenants on the part of the Northern States, the Constitution could not have been formed or adopted. A wise and patriotic conciliation pervaded the councils of the convention, which secured harmony in all their deliberations, and a unanimous vote in favor of the Constitution.

"When their work was accomplished, by order of the

convention it was submitted to the Continental Congress, accompanied by a letter from George Washington, which is so replete with just and patriotic sentiments, and so instructive as to the motives by which the convention was guided, that your committee cannot forbear to make some extracts from it. This letter, addressed to his excellency, the President of Congress, was approved September 17, 1787, by unanimous order of the convention.

“‘It is obviously impracticable,’ writes this wisest and most patriotic of statesmen, ‘in the federal government of these States, to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each, and yet provide for the interest and safety of all. Individuals entering into society must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest. The magnitude of the sacrifice must depend as well on situation and circumstances as on the object to be obtained. It is at all times difficult to draw, with precision, the line between those rights which must be surrendered and those which may be reserved; and on the present occasion, this difficulty was increased by a difference among the several States as to their situation, extent, habits, and particular interests.

“‘In all our deliberations on this subject, we kept steadily in our view that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American—the consolidation of our Union—in which is involved our property, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence. This important consideration, seriously and deeply impressed on our minds, led each State in the convention to be less rigid on points of

inferior magnitude than might have been otherwise expected; and thus the Constitution which we now present is the result of a spirit of amity, and of that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable.

“‘That it will meet the full and entire approbation of every State, is not, perhaps to be expected; but each will doubtless consider that, had her interest been alone consulted, the consequences might have been particularly disagreeable or injurious to others; that it is liable to as few exceptions as could reasonably have been expected, we hope and believe; that it may promote the lasting welfare of that country so dear to us all, and secure her freedom and happiness, is our most ardent wish.’

“It is doubtless true, that the Constitution was not, in all its details, acceptable to a single State represented in the convention. But it embodied the results of their joint counsels, governed by a spirit of concord and amity, in obedience to which each State agreed to make some concessions for the common good.

“The first Census was taken in the year 1790, and from that time to the present, the constitutional covenant in regard to the computation of three-fifths of the slave population, in ascertaining the ratio of representation, has been faithfully and honestly observed.

“In 1807, a law was passed by Congress, in conformity with the provisions of the Constitution, prohibiting the slave trade after the 1st of January, 1808. No attempt

was made to pass such a law before the day indicated by the Constitution, and therefore that covenant was also performed with scrupulous fidelity.

“In 1793, Congress, in obedience to the mandate of the Constitution, enacted a law providing for the rendition of fugitives from labor. This act was defective in many of its provisions, but in consequence of the spirit of fraternity and justice which pervaded the minds of the people of all portions of the Union, in the earlier and better days of the republic, no practical inconvenience resulted from the imperfections in the law. As a striking illustration of the just sentiments which prevailed shortly after the government of the United States went into practical operation, your committee take pleasure in referring to the patriotic action of the State of Vermont. In 1786, that State had passed a penal law to prevent the sale and transportation of negroes and mulattoes out of the State. See Haswell, ed. 117. But immediately upon her admission into the Union she repealed it, because it was supposed to be in conflict with the section of the Constitution of the United States in regard to the surrender of fugitives from labor.

In 1802, the subject of the duty of the States under the federal Constitution was referred to in the Supreme Court of Vermont, and the judges availed themselves of the occasion to give expression to sentiments which deserve to be deeply impressed on the hearts of the people of all sections. Judge Tyler remarked, ‘With respect to what

has been observed on the Constitution and laws of the Union, I will observe that whoever views attentively the Constitution of the *United States*, while he admires the wisdom which framed it, will perceive that in order to unite the interests of a numerous people, inhabiting a broad extent of territory, and possessing, from education and habits, different modes of thinking on important subjects, it was necessary to make numerous provisions in favor of local prejudices, and so to construct the Constitution, and so to enact the laws made under it, that the rights or supposed rights of all should be secured throughout the whole national domain. In compliance with the spirit of this Constitution, upon our admission into the federal Union, the statute laws of this State were revised, and a penal act, which was supposed to militate against the third member of the second section of the 4th article of the Constitution of the *United States*, was repealed; and if cases shall happen in which our local sentiments and feelings may be violated, yet I trust that the good people of *Vermont* will, on all such occasions, submit with cheerfulness to the national Constitution and laws, which, if we may wish, in some particular, more congenial to our modes of thinking, yet we must be sensible are productive of numerous and rich blessings to us as individuals, and to the State as an integral part of the Union.'

"Chief Justice Jonathan Robinson, spoke as follows: 'I concur fully in opinion with the Assistant Judge. I shall always respect the Constitution and laws of the

Union; and though it may sometimes be a reluctant, yet I shall always render a prompt obedience to them, fully sensible that while I reverence a Constitution and laws which favor the opinions and prejudices of the citizens of other sections of the Union, the same Constitution and laws contain also provisions which are favorable to our peculiar opinions and prejudices, and which may possibly be equally irreconcilable with the sentiments of the inhabitants of other States, as the very idea of slavery is to us.' See 2 Tyler's Rep. 199, 200.

"As long as the States continued to be governed in their relations to the federal government and to each other by the wise and patriotic spirit which dictated these opinions, none but the most amicable feelings could exist between them. Up to this period, therefore, no disposition was manifested in any quarter to repudiate the guarantees of the Constitution.

"The acquisition of Louisiana and Florida, embracing a large extent of territory adapted to slave labor, gave rise to some uneasiness in the Northern mind in regard to the future ascendancy of the slave States in the national councils. This uneasiness continued to increase until 1820, when it developed itself practically by an attempt to impose restrictions on the State of Missouri, as conditions precedent to her admission into the Union. It is but just, however, to state, that the struggle on this question was marked not so much by hostility to slavery as by jealousy of the growing political power of the Southern States.

The contest in regard to the terms on which Missouri should be admitted created deep feeling throughout the Union. It was the first occasion on which parties were arrayed according to geographical divisions, and it was at once perceived that a contest of that character was fraught with danger to the harmony and permanency of the Union. Fortunately, the restrictions on the State of Missouri were defeated. A line of partition was subsequently drawn through the unoccupied territory of the United States, along the parallel of $36^{\circ} 30'$ to our western frontier, with an enactment that slavery was to be prohibited in all the territory north of that line, and permitted, if desired by the people, in all south of it. By this arrangement the two systems of civilization and labor were left to progress westward, side by side.

“Under this compromise it was supposed that all causes of controversy, arising out of the irritating subject of slavery, would be banished from the halls of federal legislation. But, in a few years, an inconsiderable band of fanatics, instigated by a mischievous spirit, besieged the two Houses of Congress with petitions to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and to prohibit the slave trade between the States. The effect of these petitions was to create much irritation and ill feeling between different parts of the Union.

“Such was the aspect of the slavery question in 1843-4, when Texas, which had recently established her independence after a gallant struggle with Mexico, sought admis-

sion into our Union. There was great diversity of opinion among the people of the United States, both in the Northern and Southern States, as to the policy of receiving her into our confederacy. Animated discussions ensued in all parts of the country on this great question; and finally, so absorbing was the interest which was felt in it, that the question of admission or non-admission became an important element in the presidential election of 1844. James K. Polk was the representative of those favorable to admission, and Henry Clay of those opposed to it. On this great issue the parties went before the country, and the verdict of public opinion was in favor of the admission of Texas as a slave State, and with a stipulation in the form of an irrevocable compact, that, at a future day, four more slave States might be carved out of her vast territory, as the convenience of her advancing population might require. The Northern or non-slaveholding States which voted for Mr. Polk were Maine, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois and Michigan, giving 103 electoral votes. The slave States voting with them were Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Missouri and Arkansas—67 electoral votes.

This vast addition to the slave territory of the United States was therefore approved by the concurrent votes of the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States; and whatever responsibility belongs to the act, in a moral, social or

political aspect, necessarily attaches itself to them in common.

“The admission of Texas was soon followed by the war with Mexico, which, after a series of brilliant victories, resulted in the subjugation of her capital, and the ratification of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, by which she ceded to the United States, Upper California, New Mexico, and other territory west of our ancient frontier. The *status* of these territories, in regard to slavery, was unsettled, and immediately after the ratification of the treaty of peace, an animated struggle on this question arose in the two branches of Congress.

“The South promptly proposed a compromise, by which the line of partition along the parallel of $36^{\circ} 30'$ should be extended to the Pacific ocean, and that the covenants of the Missouri compromise should be extended to all the newly acquired territory. This proposition was rejected by the North, and an angry contest ensued, which seriously endangered the peace and tranquillity of the Union. Peaceful counsels, however, prevailed. The most eminent men of both political parties, and of all parts of the confederacy, labored together to effect an adjustment; and finally, in September, 1850, under the auspices of Clay, and Cass, and Webster, and Dickenson, and Douglas, and Foote, and other distinguished men, a series of measures were matured, sanctioned by both branches of Congress, and approved by the President.

“Under this system of compromise, California, in con-

formity with her wishes, expressed through her State convention, which, though irregularly convened, was supposed to represent the sentiments of her people, was to be admitted as a free State, and the *status* of the residue of the territory ceded by Mexico was to be determined by the people of the territories when they sought admission into the Union. The system of adjustment also embraced two other important features, one of which was adopted in deference to the wishes of the North, and the other for the benefit of the South. The first was the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and the second was the passage of a more efficient law for the rendition of fugitives from labor, to supply the defects of the act of 1793.

“This series of measures, though passed in the form of separate bills, constituted substantially one system of pacification. The passage of one act was the consideration for the passage of the others. Neither could have passed without the assurance of the passage of the others. The provisions embraced by them were in the nature of mutually dependent covenants; and, if it be possible to increase the sanctity and validity of a law by superadding the obligations of a compact and of plighted faith, no example can be found on our statute books better calculated to illustrate the principle than the fugitive slave law of 1850. All the covenants entered into by the South were of a nature which required that they should be performed

without delay, while the compensating agreements of the North were to be executed in future.

The South acquiesced in the admission of California as a free State—permitted Texas to be dismembered of a portion of her territory, in which, by her compact with her sister States, slavery was to exist—and allowed the slave trade to be prohibited in the District of Columbia. The price which the North agreed to pay for these concessions was nominal, being the recognition of the right of New Mexico and the other newly acquired territory to introduce or exclude slavery, as they might think proper, and the passage of a law which would faithfully fulfill all the constitutional requirements in regard to the surrender of fugitive slaves.

“Under this compromise, the South has performed every thing that was incumbent on her. California has been admitted as a free State, Texas has been dismembered, and the slave trade in the District of Columbia has been abolished.

“The South now asks the fulfillment of the compensating covenants on the part of the North. It is true that the fugitive slave law has passed through all the forms of legislation, and now has a place among the Acts of Congress. But it is a fact, notorious to the world, that the law is a dead letter: that while it keeps the promise to the ear, it hath broken it to the hope. From the time of its passage to the present hour, the people, the legislative assemblies, and the judicial tribunals of the Northern

States, have manifested the most determined purpose to set it at naught. Although it has been adjudged by the highest court of the United States to be in conformity with the Constitution, and therefore to be a part of the supreme law of the land, the legislatures of almost all the Northern States have passed acts to nullify or evade its practical execution. Many of their courts have interposed every obstacle in their power to its enforcement, and mobs have risen in most of the Northern cities to resist the law, and to rescue the fugitives from labor by force of arms; and several Southern citizens have been murdered whilst engaged in attempts to arrest their slaves.

“From the compendium of the Census of 1850, it appears that the number of slaves who escaped from their masters in the year 1849–50 was 1,011, whose aggregate value was near one million of dollars.

“This condition of things furnishes a striking evidence of the growth of a spirit unfriendly to the guarantees of the Constitution, and at war with all the obligations of national faith, which is in painful contrast with the patriotic conduct of Vermont in the better days of the republic, which has already been adverted to.

“The compromise measures of 1850 were by no means acceptable, in all their features, either to the North or to the South. But patriotic men of both sections were willing to sacrifice their opinions and wishes for the public good; and in 1852 both the great political parties which then divided the country, and contended for the power to guide its

policy, through their respective National Conventions, declared their purpose to abide by the compromises of 1850, and to discountenance the further agitation of the slavery question in or out of Congress. President Pierce having been elected on this platform, availed himself of the earliest appropriate occasion, in his first annual message to Congress in December, 1853, to announce his purpose to conform to the pledges given in his behalf by those who elected him.

“In 1854, a bill was introduced into Congress, under the auspices of a distinguished senator from Illinois, for the organization of territorial governments in Kansas and Nebraska. As originally reported, the bill was silent in regard to slavery. Subsequently, the bill was modified so as to embrace a clause which declared the law of 1820—commonly known as the Missouri Compromise Act—inoperative and void; and in this form it became a law. The avowed object of the mover and friends of the bill was to remove the slavery agitation from the halls of Congress, and to localize it, by confining it to the territories as they should respectively be in a condition to establish their own municipal institutions. The bill declared on its face that its true intent and meaning was ‘not to legislate slavery into any territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.’

“The passage of this law furnished the pretext for the

revival, with increased bitterness, of all the sectional feuds which had been temporarily allayed by the measures of 1850. Throughout the Northern States, old party lines were almost obliterated, and a new Northern political organization sprang into existence, under the designation of the Republican Party. This organization was distinctly sectional in its character, and it soon acquired the ascendancy in almost every Northern State. The ostensible object of this party was to organize public opinion in opposition to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and to the extension of slavery into new territories. But it soon became evident, from the sectional character of the party, the doctrines which it inculcated, and the policy which it pursued, that its real purpose was to make war upon the institution of slavery itself. Your committee have no doubt that the ulterior designs of the leaders of the party were carefully concealed from the great body of those who enlisted under its banner, and who would have then recoiled from the idea of invading the acknowledged rights of the Southern States, and trampling under foot the solemn compacts of the Constitution. The object was to obtain the co-operation of the Northern people, by the specious pretenses of opposition to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and to the extension of slavery, and then, by the force of party affinities and discipline, to lead or drive them into open warfare on the institution itself.

“The first evidence of the true design of the Republi-

can party, is to be found in their failure to seek the assistance and co-operation of those citizens of the Southern States who were equally opposed with themselves to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the whole policy of the Government in regard to Kansas and Nebraska. If their purposes had been such as they represented them to be at the outset, they would naturally have sought the alliance of all who concurred with them in sentiment, without reference to geographical divisions. This they declined to do, and for the first time in the history of our country, the spectacle was exhibited of a party organized on a strictly sectional basis. The dangers likely to result from the formation of such parties were foreseen by the Father of his country, and constituted the subject of one of his most solemn admonitions to his countrymen in his Farewell Address. These are his impressive words :

“ ‘In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as a matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations, *Northern* and *Southern*, *Atlantic* and *Western*, whence designing men may endeavor to incite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence with particular districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart-burnings which spring from these misrepresenta-

tions. They tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection.'

"The purposes of the party were still further disclosed, when they assembled in their National Convention, to give formal and authentic expression to their political creed, and to select their candidate for the Presidency. In one of the resolutions adopted by that body, they avow the opinion that slavery stands on the same level with polygamy, and denounce both as 'twin relics of barbarism.' By this declaration they seek to place all the Southern States outside of the pale of civilization, and to cover with obloquy and reproach the memory of Washington, Jefferson, Henry, Madison, Marshall, Clay, Calhoun, Lowndes, and the whole host of Southern patriots, whose illustrious names constitute the brightest jewels in the treasury of our national fame.

"When it was supposed that public opinion was sufficiently prepared for the announcement, we find the doctrine openly proclaimed in various parts of the North, by the representative men of the Republican party, that there exists an irrepressible conflict between the social systems of the North and the South, which must progress until one or the other is exterminated.

"Such is the organization, and such are the cardinal doctrines of the Republican party, as derived from the legitimate exponents of their faith and policy.

"If we turn to the legislative action of the Northern States, in which that party has obtained the ascendancy,

we find that it is in strict conformity with their mischievous dogmas. Their statute books are filled with enactments conceived in a spirit of hostility to the institutions of the South, at war with the true intent and meaning of the Federal compact, and adopted for the avowed purpose of rendering nugatory some of the express covenants of the Constitution of the United States.

"It would extend this report to an unreasonable length, if your committee should attempt to review this unfriendly legislation in detail. They will, therefore, content themselves with a brief reference to some of the most prominent features of these laws.

"Maine.

"By the laws of this State it is provided, that if a fugitive slave shall be arrested, he shall be defended by the Attorney for the Commonwealth, and all expenses of such defense paid out of the public treasury. The use of all State and county jails, and of all buildings belonging to the State, are forbidden the reception or securing fugitive slaves; and all officers are forbidden, under heavy penalties, from arresting or aiding in the arrest of such fugitives. If a slaveholder, or other person, shall unlawfully seize or confine a fugitive slave, he shall be liable to be imprisoned for not more than five years, or fined not exceeding \$1,000. If a slaveholder take a slave into the State, the slave is thereby made free; and if the master undertake to exercise any control over him, he is subjected

to imprisonment for not less than one year, or fined not exceeding \$1,000.

“The Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court has been declared unconstitutional, and many offensive and inflammatory resolutions have been passed by the Legislature.

“*New Hampshire.*

“Your committee have not had access to a complete series of the laws of this State. But a general index, which has been consulted, shows that a law exists by which all slaves entering the State, either with or without the consent of their masters, are declared free; and any attempt to capture or hold them is declared to be a felony.

“*Vermont.*

“This State seems to have entirely forgotten the conservative and law-abiding sentiment which governed its action in the earlier period of her history.

“Her law now forbids all citizens and officers of the State from executing or assisting to execute the fugitive slave law, or to arrest a fugitive slave, under penalty or imprisonment for not less than one year, or a fine not exceeding \$1,000. It also forbids the use of all public jails and buildings, for the purpose of securing such slaves. The Attorneys for the State are directed, at public expense, to defend, and procure to be discharged, every person arrested as a fugitive slave. The *habeas corpus* act also provides that fugitive slaves shall be tried by jury,

and interposes other obstacles to the execution of the fugitive slave law.

“The law further provides, that all persons unlawfully capturing, seizing or confining a person as a fugitive slave, shall be confined in the State prison not more than ten years, and fined not exceeding \$1,000. Every person held as a slave, who shall be brought into the State, is declared free; and all persons who shall hold or attempt to hold as a slave any person so brought into the State, in any form, or for any time, however short, shall be confined in the State prison not less than one nor more than fifteen years, and fined not exceeding \$2,000. The Legislature has also passed sundry offensive resolutions.

“*Massachusetts.*

“The laws of this State forbid, under heavy penalties, her citizens, and State and county officers, from executing the fugitive slave law, or from arresting a fugitive slave, or from aiding in either; and denies the use of her jails and public buildings for such purposes.

The Governor is required to appoint commissioners in every county to aid fugitive slaves in recovering their freedom, when proceeded against as fugitive slaves, and all costs attending such proceedings are directed to be paid by the State.

“Any person who shall remove, or attempt to remove, or come into the State with the intention to remove or assist in removing any person who is not a fugitive slave,

within the meaning of the Constitution, is liable to punishment by fine not less than \$1,000 nor more than \$5,000, and imprisonment not less than one nor more than five years.

“Their *habeas corpus* act gives trial by jury to fugitive slaves, and interposes other unlawful impediments to the execution of the fugitive slave law. Her Legislature has also passed violent and offensive resolutions.

“ *Connecticut.*

“This State, which as late as 1840 tolerated slavery within her own borders, as appears by the Census of that year, prohibits, under severe penalties, all her officers from aiding in executing the fugitive slave law, and vacates all official acts which may be done by them in attempting to execute that law.

“By the Act of 1854, Sec. 1, it is provided, that every person who shall falsely and maliciously declare, represent, or pretend that any person entitled to freedom is a slave, or owes service or labor to any person or persons, with intent to procure or to aid or assist in procuring the forcible removal of such free person from this State as a slave, shall pay a fine of \$5,000, and shall be imprisoned five years in the State prison.

““Sec. 2. In all cases arising under this act, the truth of any declaration, representation or pretense that any person being or having been in this State, is or was a slave, or owes or did owe service or labor to any other person or

persons, shall not be deemed proved, except by the testimony of at least two credible witnesses testifying to facts directly tending to the truth of such declaration, pretense or representation, or by legal evidence equivalent thereto.'

"Sec. 3 subjects to a fine of \$5,000 and imprisonment in the State prison for five years, all who shall seize any person entitled to freedom, with intent to have such person held in slavery.

"Sec. 4 prohibits the admission of depositions in all cases under this act, and provides that if any witness testifies falsely *in behalf of the party accused* and prosecuted under this act, he shall be fined \$5,000 and imprisoned for five years in the State prison. This law is, in the opinion of your committee, but little short of an invitation to perjury, by imposing no penalties for false swearing *against* the party accused.

"The resolutions of the Legislature are offensive and disorganizing.

"Rhode Island.

"The statutes of Rhode Island provide that any one who transports, or causes to be transported by land or water, any person lawfully inhabiting therein, to any place without the limits of the State, except by due course of law, shall be imprisoned not less than one nor more than ten years. They also prohibit all officers from aiding in executing the fugitive slave law, or arresting a fugitive slave, and deny the use of her jails and public buildings for securing any such fugitive.

“ *New York.*

“This State has enacted that every person who shall, without lawful authority, remove or attempt to remove from this State any fugitive slave, shall forfeit to the party aggrieved, five hundred dollars, and be imprisoned not exceeding ten years in the State prison; and all accessories after the fact are also liable to imprisonment.

“The *habeas corpus* act provides that fugitive slaves shall be entitled to trial by jury, and makes it the duty of all Commonwealth's Attorneys to defend fugitive slaves at the expense of the State.

“New York has a fugitive law of her own, which is of no practical use, and has forbidden her judicial officers from proceeding under any other law.

“Prior to 1841, persons not inhabitants of the State were allowed to take their slaves with them, and to keep them in the State for a limited time; but the law has been repealed.

“ *New Jersey.*

“Her law provides that if any person shall forcibly take away from this State any man, woman or child, bond or free, into another State, he shall be fined not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment at hard labor not exceeding five years, or both.

“The *habeas corpus* act gives a trial by jury to fugitive slaves, and all judicial officers are prohibited from acting under any other than the law of New Jersey.

“Pennsylvania.

“Prior to 1847, non-resident owners of slaves were allowed to retain them in Pennsylvania not exceeding six months. In 1847, this privilege was revoked. Slaves are also allowed to testify in all cases in the courts of Pennsylvania. It is further provided by law, that any person ‘who violently and tumultuously seizes upon any negro or mulatto, and carries such negro away to any place, either with or without the intention of taking such negro before a district or circuit judge, shall be fined not exceeding \$1,000, and imprisoned in the county jail not exceeding three months. The law also punishes, with heavy fine and imprisonment in the penitentiary, any person who may forcibly carry away, or attempt to carry away, any free negro or mulatto from the States. The sale of fugitive slaves is prohibited under heavy penalties, and a trial by jury is secured to fugitive slaves, in violation of the laws of the United States.

“Illinois.

“Illinois has prohibited, under pain of imprisonment of not less than one nor more than seven years, any person from stealing or arresting any slave, with the design of taking such slave out of the State, without first having established his claim thereto, according to the laws of the United States. These penalties will be incurred by the master who pursues his slave across the border, and appre-

hends him without waiting for the action of commissioner or courts.

“Indiana.

“Some of the laws of this State are favorable to the recovery of fugitives from labor. But the law as to kidnapping is similar to that of Illinois, as above noted, except that the penalties are greater. The fine is not less than \$100 nor more than \$5,000, and the term of imprisonment not less than two nor more than fourteen years.

“Ohio.

“In 1858, the most offensive parts of the laws of this State were repealed. It is understood, however, that measures are in contemplation, if they have not been already initiated, to re-enact them.

“Michigan.

“The laws of this State are peculiarly obnoxious to criticism. They not only deny the use of the jails and public buildings to secure fugitive slaves, and require the Attorneys for the Commonwealth to defend them at the expense of the State, but the law of Connecticut in relation to the punishment of persons falsely alleging others to be slaves, is adopted, with the addition that any person who carries a slave into this State, claiming him as such, shall be punished by imprisonment in the State prison for a period not exceeding ten years, or by a fine not exceeding \$1,000.

“The *habeas corpus* act provides for trial by jury of claims to fugitive slaves.

“Resolutions have also been adopted by the Legislature, urging the repeal of the fugitive slave law, and the prohibition of slavery in the District of Columbia and the territories.

“*Wisconsin.*

“Following the example of her sister States of the North, in parts of their hostile legislation, this State has, in some particulars, gone beyond all the rest. She has directed her District Attorneys, in all cases of fugitive slaves, to appear for and defend them at the expense of the State. She has required the issue of the writ of *habeas corpus*, on the mere statement of the District Attorney that a person in custody is detained as a fugitive slave, and directs all her judicial and executive officers who have reason to believe that a person is about to be arrested or claimed on such ground, to give notice to the District Attorney of the county where the person resides. If a judge, in vacation, fails to discharge the arrested fugitive slave on *habeas corpus*, an appeal is allowed to the next circuit Court. Trial by jury is to be granted at the election of either party, and all costs of trial, which would otherwise fall on the fugitive, are assumed by the State. A law has also been enacted, similar to that of Connecticut, for the punishment of one who shall falsely and maliciously declare a person to be a fugitive slave, with intent to aid in procuring the

forcible removal of such person from the State as a slave. A section is added to the provisions of this Connecticut law, for the punishment, by imprisonment in the State prison, of any person who shall obstruct the execution of a warrant issued under it, or aid in the escape of the person accused. Another section forbids the enforcement of a judgment recovered for violation of the 'fugitive slave act,' by the sale of any real or personal property in the State, and makes its provisions applicable to judgments theretofore rendered. *

"The law relative to kidnapping punishes the forcible seizure, without lawful authority, of any person of color, with intent to cause him to be sent out of the State or sold as a slave, or in any manner to transfer his service or labor, or the actual selling or transferring the service of such person, by imprisonment in the State prison from one to two years, or by fine from five hundred to one thousand dollars. The consent of the person seized, sold or transferred, not to be a defense, unless it appear to the jury that it was not obtained by fraud, nor extorted by duress or by threats.

"Iowa.

"The law of this State is similar to that of Indiana, except that here there seems to be no direct provision favoring the recovery of fugitive slaves. Like that of Indiana and Illinois, the law as to kidnapping may be so construed as greatly to obstruct the arrest of such fugitives. The maximum of punishment is, however, some-

thing less, being five years in the State prison, and a fine of \$1,000.

“Offensive resolutions have also been adopted by its Legislature.

“*Minnesota.*

“What is to be objected to the legislation of this State is, that there is no sufficient recognition of the right of the master to recover his fugitive slave; and consequently, even if such was not the *design* of the omission, the way is left open for the perversion of the law relative to the writ of *habeas corpus*, to the injury of slave owners.

“Such are some of the evidences derived from official sources, of the rapid growth of unkind feelings among the people of the North to their brethren of the South. But there are others, which are too significant to be entirely overlooked.

“The recent debates in the Congress of the United States have disclosed the remarkable fact, that sixty-eight Republican members of Congress have united in a written endorsement and recommendation to public favor, of an atrocious libel on Southern institutions, prepared by a man who was openly denounced, on the floor of the Senate of the United States, by a Senator from his own State, as unworthy of trust and confidence. This infamous publication, thus commended to public approval by the regularly accredited representatives of near six millions of Northern people, abounds in the most insidious appeals to the non-slaveholders of the Southern States, and seeks

to inflame the minds of the slaves of the South, and to incite them to rise in rebellion against the authority of their masters; to murder them and their families, and to ravage the country with fire and sword. Yet, with a full knowledge of all these facts, one of the endorsers of this libel on fifteen States of the confederacy, has been nominated and persistently pressed by the members of the Republican party, for election to the Speakership of the House of Representatives of the United States; and not one of the members of that party has been restrained, by reason of that endorsement, from giving him a cordial support.

“Thus, under a Constitution formed to ‘establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity,’ we behold a large number of the representatives of the people, who had sworn to support that Constitution, lending all their influence, personal and official, to defeat the great objects for which it was formed, to array section against section, and to fill the country with all the horrors of servile insurrection and intestine strife.

“Your committee might also refer to the offensive tone of a portion of the Northern press and pulpit, and to the libellous resolutions of numerous popular assemblies in the Northern States, as evidences of the decline of that spirit of fraternity and unity which animated our fathers in the days of our revolutionary struggle. These are the

ordinary channels through which public opinion makes itself heard and felt. But it would probably be uncharitable to the Northern people to hold them responsible for all the ravings of fanatical agitators; and we therefore prefer to rely on those authentic manifestations of unfriendly feeling proceeding from the official representatives of the people, and for which the constituent body is justly responsible.

“Your committee cheerfully acquit a large number of the Northern people of any positive and active participation in these aggressions on Southern rights and interests. The recent demonstrations of popular feeling made in some of the Northern cities, are accepted in the spirit in which they were offered. But abstract resolutions in favor of the guarantees of the Constitution are of no avail, unless they are followed by corresponding action. As long as the conservative people of the North remain passive, and permit agitators and fanatics and enemies of the South to fill positions of public trust, and to speak and to act on behalf of their respective States, they cannot escape the responsibility which attaches to their declarations and acts. Those who have it in their power to prevent the perpetration of a wrong, and fail to exercise that power, must to a great extent be responsible for the wrong itself.

“Thus the conservative men of the North are responsible for the organization and action of the Republican party. It was their duty to have prevented it, and they

had the power to fulfill that duty. They preferred, however, to remain inactive, and thus permitted the Republican party to obtain the ascendancy in the State and national councils. They could not have been ignorant of the fact that such an organization must necessarily prove dangerous to the Union. They must have foreseen that a party organized on the basis of hostility to slavery extension, would very soon become a party opposed to slavery itself. The whole argument against the *extension* of slavery is soon, by a very slight deflection, made to bear against the *existence* of slavery, and thus the anti-extension idea is merged in that of abolition. Accordingly we find, notwithstanding the denial by the Republican party of any purpose to interfere with slavery where it exists, that the tendency of its policy is to its extermination everywhere.

“The logical consequences of their teachings have been exhibited in the recent raid at Harper’s Ferry; and so long as that party maintains its present sectional organization, and inculcates its present doctrines, the South can expect nothing less than a succession of such traitorous attempts to subvert its institutions and to incite its slaves to rapine and murder. The crimes of John Brown were neither more nor less than practical illustrations of the doctrines of the leaders of the Republican party. The very existence of such a party is an offense to the whole South.

Whether the recent outrages perpetrated upon the soil

and citizens of Virginia will have the effect of awakening the conservative sentiment of the North into efficient action, remains to be seen. Your committee cannot relinquish the hope that such will be its effect, and that thus good may come out of evil. Your committee have no appeals or remonstrances to address to their fellow-citizens of the North. They doubtless comprehend their obligations under the Constitution to the people of the South. If they shall in future show a readiness to fulfill those obligations, Virginia and the other Southern States are prepared to bury the past in oblivion, and to respond with cordiality to every manifestation of a returning spirit of fraternity. As Virginia was among the foremost in the struggle for national independence, and contributed as much as any other State to the formation of the constitutional Union, she would be among the last to abandon it, provided its obligations be faithfully observed. Her sons having been educated to cherish 'a cordial, habitual and immovable attachment to our national Union—accustomed to think and speak of it as the palladium of their political safety and prosperity, watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety, discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it may in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.'

"But the Union which they have been taught to love

and revere is the Union contemplated by the Constitution—a Union of communities having equal rights—a Union regulated and governed by the principles of the Constitution—a Union of sovereign States, entitled to regulate their domestic affairs in their own way, and bound to fulfill their obligations to each other with scrupulous fidelity. When it shall cease to be such a Union, it will have forfeited all claims to their respect and affection. Virginia feels that she has discharged her whole duty to her sister States, and she asks nothing from them that is not guaranteed to her by the plain terms of the federal compact. She has not sought officiously to intermeddle with the domestic concerns of other States, and she demands that they shall refrain from all interference with hers.

“But it is clear, from the review of the condition of the public sentiment of the Northern States for the last five years, as indicated by their legislation and in other authentic forms, that many of their people have ceased to respect the rights of the Southern States, to recognize the obligations of the federal compact, or to cherish for us those friendly sentiments which gave birth to the Constitution of the United States. A proper sense of self-respect and the instinct of self-preservation, therefore, require that we should adopt such measures as may be necessary to secure ourselves against future aggression, and to meet every emergency which may hereafter arise. We desire nothing but friendly relations with our sister States of the North. We ask of them nothing to which they have not

solemnly bound themselves by the compact of the Constitution. But we understand our rights, and we are resolutely determined to maintain them. We disclaim all aggressive purposes. But when we are threatened with the knife of the assassin and torch of the incendiary, we cannot fold our arms in blind security. We have no desire to rupture the political, commercial or social ties which bind us to the North, so long as our rights are respected; but, admonished by the past, it is our duty to prepare for the future by placing ourselves in an attitude of defense, and by adopting such measures as may be necessary for our security and welfare.

“Your committee, therefore, recommend to the General Assembly, the following resolutions for adoption:

“1. *Resolved*, That the appropriate standing committees of the two Houses of the General Assembly be instructed to prepare and report such bills as in their judgment may be necessary to organize, arm and equip the militia of the State for active and efficient service

“2. *Resolved*, That the committees on finance be instructed to prepare and report such bills as in their judgment may be most effectual (without violating the provisions of the Constitution of the United States) in encouraging the domestic manufactures of our own State, promoting direct trade with foreign countries, and establishing, as far as may be practicable, our commercial independence.

“3. *Resolved*, That we earnestly invite the co-operation

of our sister States of the South in carrying out the policy indicated in the foregoing resolutions.

"4. *Resolved*, That the committees for courts of justice be instructed to report such bills as may be necessary to secure the more prompt and effectual punishment of all foreign emissaries and others, who may be found guilty of conspiring against the peace of our community, or seeking to incite our slaves to insurrection.

"5. *Resolved*, That the course of the late Governor, in regard to the Harper's Ferry affair, is amply vindicated by the evidence before the committee, and entitles him to the emphatic commendation of the country."

NOTE.—When the British were overrunning the Southern States under Lord Cornwallis and Cockburn, they scattered proclamations broadcast, offering freedom and gold to the slaves if they would desert their masters. Yet, notwithstanding these offers of the British, very few negroes deserted their masters in the hour of their need; but on the contrary fought hard for the protection of their masters and mistresses; and such would prove to be the case again, should war commence between the South and her enemies. At New Orleans, when the British under Lord Packenham marched against the city, inciting the blacks to turn against their masters and receive their freedom, they were answered with a volley of musketry, and no men fought harder at the Battle of New Orleans than the Negroes. What does this show but affection for the master?

In regard to the few slaves whom the British induced to desert their masters, the following will show how they were afterward treated.

"Cockburn, the Commander of the British, returned to his barges with a valuable booty, and a number of slaves, whom he had induced to leave their masters under a promise of freedom, which he afterward redeemed by selling them in the West Indies."—Page 137, "Breckenridge's History of the Late War." Such is the philanthropic feeling that inspired the British (whom Helper, Seward & Co. are following in the footsteps of) during the late War.

CHAPTER VI.

Helper's Book Ruining the Trade of the North—Trade Crushed—The Bankruptcy of the entire North predicted—Helper's Advice to the North adopted by the entire South—Republican Party Responsible for the Withdrawal of the Southern Trade—"The Shoe commences to Pinch"—Helper's Statistics of the Prices of Land in the South demolished.

"INSCRIBED on the banner which we herewith unfurl to the world, with the full and fixed determination to stand by it or *die* by it, unless one of more virtuous efficacy shall be presented, are the mottoes which, in substance, embody the principles, as we conceive, that should govern us in our patriotic warfare against the most subtle and insidious foe that ever menaced the inalienable rights and liberties and dearest interests of America!

1st. Thorough Organization and Independent Political Action on the part of the Non-slaveholding Whites of the South.

2nd. Ineligibility of Slaveholders—Never another Vote to the Trafficker in Human Flesh.

3rd. No Co-operation with Slaveholders in Politics—No Fellowship with them in Religion—No Affiliation with them in Society.

4th. No Patronage to Slaveholding Merchants—No Guestships in Slave-waiting Hotels—No Fees to Slaveholding Lawyers—No Employment of Slaveholding Physicians—No Audience to Slaveholding Parsons.

5th. No Recognition of Pro-slavery men, except as Ruffians, Outlaws and Criminals.

6th. Abrupt Discontinuance of Subscription to Pro-slavery Newspapers.

7th. The greatest possible Encouragement to Free White Labor.

8th. No more Hiring of Slaves by Non-slaveholders.

9th. Immediate Death to Slavery; or, if not immediate, Unqualified Proscription of its Advocates during the Period of its Existence.

10th. A Tax of Sixty Dollars on every Slaveholder for each and every Negro in his possession at the present time, or at any intermediate time between now and the 4th of July, 1863; said money to be applied to the transportation of the Blacks to Liberia, to their colonization in Central or South America, or to their comfortable settlement within the boundaries of the United States.

11th. An additional Tax of Forty Dollars per annum, to be levied annually, on every Slaveholder for each and every Negro found in his possession after the 4th of July, 1863; said money to be paid into the hands of the Negroes so held in slavery; or, in cases of death, to their next of kin, and to be used by them at their own option."

Such is the platform as laid down by Helper, and adopted by sixty-eight Members of Congress of the "Black Republican Party." We shall take this, then, as the platform of the Republican party, as it was under the direction of the "*Publishing Committee*," of that party, that Helper's incendiary work was published, the proceeds of which are to be used in *buying* up the votes of *free negroes* and poor, miserable outcasts as well as disaffected persons, for the support of their nominee, and to make war on one part of our confederacy with. Conservative people of the North!! will you submit to the party adopting such a platform ever assuming the reins of power of this government?

Now, let us see how this platform will work. The South, having in view her safety as well as danger, has, to a certain extent, (and will soon fully) adopted the first sentence of the fourth section of Helper's platform, (*i. e.*, Republican,) with the following modification: "No Patronage to *Northern (Sectional)* Merchants." Let us consider the result that has followed the adoption of the above,—without further comment, as it speaks for itself. And, in doing so, we would present to the consideration of the reader the present state of affairs in New England, the whole of which is attributable to the interference of the North with Southern *rights* and Southern *institutions*.

MANUFACTORIES IN THE SOUTH, AS COPIED FROM THE CORRESPONDENT OF THE NEW YORK HERALD.

COLUMBUS, GA., Feb. 3, 1860.

In these non-intercourse and disunion times, a sketch of the

principal cotton and woolen mills in this State may not prove uninteresting to your readers. That Georgia is a great manufacturing as well as producing State I think there can be no doubt. For years past, all the coarse plantation goods consumed within the borders of the State have been manufactured, not in New England, but at home. Besides some thirty cotton and woolen mills now in successful operation, there are numerous machine shops, foundries, and paper mills, established in all the leading towns where there is water power, while flour mills and distilleries are common in every village. With the natural advantages afforded the people, in the shape of water power and a long navigable river, it is no wonder that they should have made the attempt to compete with Northern manufacturers. That they have succeeded in making coarse goods as cheap as they can be made in New England, is pretty evident. Let non-intercourse be established, and how easy will it be for Georgia to supply half of the Southern States with plantation goods such as she now manufactures. Even to-day, her fabrics find their way into Alabama and Mississippi, and so pressing is the demand upon manufacturers in this city, that they find it difficult to supply the numerous orders sent to them daily. The mills are all doing a thriving business, and are increasing in size and number every year. By-and-by, fine goods will be manufactured here, and the millions annually spent at the North for prints, muslins, etc., will be expended here at home among our own manufacturers. How will Massachusetts feel then?

Columbus, at the head of steam navigation on the Chattahoochee river, is destined to become one of the largest manufacturing places in the South. The fall of the river at this point is fourteen feet, and with the present dam it is calculated there is sufficient power to drive 194,877 spindles, and consume 48,000 bales of cotton annually. There are five mills now in operation, each doing a thriving business. The Eagle Manu-

facturing Company's mills rank first perhaps in point of importance. They are carried on under the superintendence of J. Rhodes Brown, and have been in operation since 1850. About 300,000 pounds of wool and 1,600 bales of cotton are annually consumed, producing about \$225,000 worth of goods. The building is a very massive one, the walls being thirty-four inches thick at the base. It is four stories and basement high. Each floor is supported by girders 12 by 14 inches thick, and three rows of substantial columns. The flooring is four inches in thickness, and constructed of two layers of planking. The basement is occupied as a picking-room, where there are three machines attended by six hands. The wool carding-room is also on this floor. There are seven sets of cards, employing twelve persons. The first floor is used for carding cotton. On this floor there are forty-eight carding machines, with the necessary drawing machines and speeders, employing twenty hands, mostly boys. The weaving room is on the second floor. Here there are 136 looms in operation, giving employment to some seventy girls, two overseers, and a few small boys. Each loom is capable of manufacturing from thirty-five to forty yards of osnaburgs and kerseys a day. The most skillful of the girls receive one dollar a day, but there are many who get only fifty cents. On the third floor the spinning is carried on. There are thirty spinning frames and five thousand spindles in operation, giving employment to seventy children. On this floor there are also spoolers and warpers necessary to prepare yarn for the dressing and sizing frames; also a rope machine capable of turning out one hundred thousand pounds of rope annually, and machinery for the manufacture of cotton yarn and sewing thread. On the fourth floor are twelve hundred and forty woolen spindles, warping mills, dressing and sizing frames and beaming machines, employing about twenty hands. Connected with the mill is a dyeing establishment, and the office of the agent. About 225 operatives in all are employed in this estab-

lishment. The Eagle Mills do a flourishing business. Last year a dividend of ten per cent. was declared; this year it will be increased to twelve per cent. Nothing but osnaburgs, kerseys and jeans are manufactured.

The Howard Mills, in the same neighborhood, employ some 200 hands, and manufacture nothing but cotton goods. 5,000 spindles are in operation.

The Grant Mills employ about 100 hands in the manufacture of osnaburgs and kerseys.

The Columbus Factory, situated about three miles above the city, manufactures osnaburgs and kerseys. There is a boot and shoe factory, a tan-yard and flour mill attached. Some 200 hands are employed in this establishment.

The Cowetta Falls Factory, established in 1844, employs some seventy-five operatives. 2,700 spindles are in operation.

The Macon Manufacturing Company, at Macon, manufacture a superior article of sheeting and shirtings, employing some 180 hands.

At Seven Islands, on the Ocmulgee river, is the Planter's Factory,—spindles 3,200, employing 75 hands.

The Milledgeville Manufacturing Company, at Milledgeville, employ about 120 operatives, and run 3,136 spindles, principally in the manufacture of osnaburgs and sheetings.

Sweet Water Cotton factory, situated on Sweet Water creek, in Campbell county, is designed for 6,000 spindles and 90 looms.

Bowen's factory, on Snake creek, Carroll county, employs some 50 hands.

Athens Manufacturing Company, in Clark county,—2,500 spindles. Number of operatives, 90.

Princeton Manufacturing Company, on the Oconee river, two miles below Athens. Cotton spindles, 2,184, wool do., 240.

Mars Hill factory, on Barber's creek, seven miles below Athens. Spindles, 350. Looms, 12.

White's Georgia factory, also on Barber's creek. Spindles, 1,704. Looms, 20.

Schley's cotton mills, about 10 miles from Augusta, employ a large number of hands.

Roswell Manufacturing Company, on Vickery's creek, Cobb county,—two mills, 10,000 spindles, employing about 350 persons. Heavy cotton goods only manufactured.

Augusta Manufacturing Company, near Augusta; spindles, 10,000; looms, 200, each capable of turning out from forty to forty-five yards per day. Number of operatives employed, 400.

On Broad river, four miles above its junction with Savannah, there is a cotton factory which employs nearly 100 hands. 5,000 spindles are in operation.

Long Shoals factory in Greene County, and Skull Shoals, in the same neighborhood, manufacture a large quantity of cotton goods.

In Henry County, near McDonough, there is a large factory in operation.

High Shoals factory, on the Appalachee river, makes domestics and yarns.

Eaton Manufacturing Company, on Little river, runs 1,836 spindles and thirty-six looms.

Richmond factory, on Spirit creek, near Augusta, runs 1,500 spindles and forty looms. Number of operatives seventy.

Troup factory, near Lagrange, runs 1,600 spindles, and employs sixty-five operatives in the manufacture of osnaburgs.

Franklin factory, on Tobler's creek, Upson County, runs 1,320 spindles.

Wayman's factory, on the same stream, runs 1,664 spindles and twenty-six looms.

Flint River factory, runs 1,560 spindles and twenty-six looms.

Thomaston factory, on Potato creek, Upson County, runs 1,260 spindles, and employs fifty hands.

Rock Mills factory, on the Ogeechee river, Warren County runs 600 spindles, employing forty hands.

Brothers' factory, in the same neighborhood, runs 1,000 spindles and employs thirty hands.

Joy Mill, on Vickery creek, manufactures colored stuffs for pantaloons, and employs some fifty hands.

The operatives in all these factories are white people, chiefly girls and boys from twelve to twenty years of age. On an average, they are better paid and worked easier than is usually the case in the North. Country girls from the pine forests, as green and awkward as it is possible to find them, soon become skillful operatives, and ere they have been in the mills a year, they are able to earn from four to six dollars a week. They are only required to work ten hours a day. Particular attention is paid to the character of the operatives; and in some mills, none are received but those having testimonials of good moral character and industrious habits. Churches and Sunday-schools are also attached to several of the manufactories, so that the religious training of the operatives may be properly attended to.

LOUISIANA.

NEW ORLEANS, Jan. 25, 1860.

The State of Louisiana was never in a more prosperous condition than now. The new Governor, Thomas O. Moore, has just been sworn into office, and begins his administration under the most auspicious circumstances. There is a surplus of \$130,000 in the State treasury. The critical condition of national affairs, precipitated by the champions of the "irrepressible conflict," seems to overshadow all differences of local politics, and it is the universal sentiment that the South must brace itself to meet the "impending crisis." Virginia and

the border States will not be left to sustain, unaided, the brunt of the battle with Abolitionism. Already a bill has been introduced into the State Legislature, appropriating \$25,000 as Louisiana's quota toward a fund to be contributed by the Southern States, to repay to Virginia the outlay she has incurred in hanging the Brown gang. The bill will pass, beyond a doubt. Very active measures have also been taken to arm and organize the militia. It is now settled that our heavy houses will import direct from Europe for the future. Indeed, the only wonder is that they have not taken this step long ago. The leading wholesale dry goods dealers are prominent in the movement. A cotton factory on a very extensive scale is soon to go into operation. A vessel freighted with all the requisite machinery arrived on Saturday, and is now discharging. Every expedient is being adopted to render this section, as far as may be, independent of the North; and there is even a project on foot among some of our wealthy and spirited capitalists to start a large publishing house in this city—a branch of enterprise in which our people have, until now, been sadly inert. There can be no doubt that such a business, once established, would be liberally sustained. Commercially speaking, the last week has been the most active ever known here. The sales of cotton amounted to 97,500 bales. That number has never been equalled here, and but twice, I believe, in Liverpool. A larger proportion than ever, of cotton, is this year shipped to France. In a few years, Havre will rival Liverpool in its cotton imports. The direct cotton trade with St. Petersburg is also rapidly on the increase. On a single day last week, no less than three ships, freighted with bales, cleared for Cronstadt. It was believed that about the middle of the present month the receipts of cotton would begin to slacken off; but there are, as yet, no signs of a decrease. Shippers are consequently busy, and freights continue stiff.

IOWA.

IOWA CITY, Jan. 27, 1860.

The excitement attending the John Brown foray is fast dying out in the Northwest, and in no State faster than in Iowa. True, the same spirit that gave rise to the outburst of public feeling upon the occasion of Brown's execution, is still here, but it requires some sudden^d blast to fan it to a flame. For the time being, Helper's book served to feed the morbid abolition appetite of the Brownites of Iowa, and the deeds of the heroic martyr are seemingly forgotten.

Next to Michigan, Iowa is the most completely and thoroughly abolitionized State in the Northwest; it is, therefore, not surprising that Brown here found practical exponents of Sewardism, or that Helper finds champions in the deliberative councils of the rulers of the State. Whatever dodges the Republican party elsewhere may resort to, to cover their participation, directly or indirectly, with Brown's attack on Harper's Ferry, or shield themselves from complicity with the circulation of Helper's book, the Republicans of Iowa feel themselves strong enough to throw off the mask and boldly avow their sympathy with the one and their approval of the other. A Republican county convention, held at Muscatine a short time since, passed a resolution endorsing Helper's book and recommending its circulation. This is the first public endorsement of the book that I have yet heard of; but I have yet to meet the first Republican, here or elsewhere, who has read the book, who does not endorse it and recommend its circulation. John Sherman may prove an exception, and entertain opinions in regard to the book contrary to those of the Republican party generally, but he is sustained from day to day by men whose constituents I know openly avow their approval of the "Impending Crisis," and who recommend its circulation. Large numbers of the book are being sold

throughout the Northwest, and if the work possesses any merit, its influence must be powerful

MISSOURI.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., Feb. 1, 1860.

Politics and politicians in Missouri are considerably mixed just now, and withal somewhat disturbed, arising chiefly from local matters. John Brown is dead, and his memory has scarce an abiding place in this State, while "Helper's Impending Crisis" flourishes not at all. The absence of two such powerful incentives to inflame the public mind in the border States necessarily gives the sober second thought ample scope for the undisturbed exercise of its true functions; and, as a sequence, the public mind in Missouri is unusually quiet upon matters of general interest.

The excitement attending the raid upon Harper's Ferry subsided with the death of John Brown, and little is now thought or said concerning the matter; and, although a border State, and exposed upon all sides to the forays of fanatics and abolition outlaws, the people repose implicit confidence in their ability to repel invasion or suppress insurrection, and pursue the "even tenor of their way," and pay little heed to the howl of disunion that rises upon every side.

A majority of the people of Missouri are undoubtedly in favor of perpetuating the "peculiar institution," not from any deep-seated love for the institution itself, but chiefly because it is profitable; and, so long as it continues to be so, it will never be abolished. In fact, it is now steadily increasing. The last report of the Secretary of State shows an increase of about 1,200 in the slave population of the State during the past year. In 1840 the slave population of Missouri numbered 58,240, and in 1850, 87,422. It now amounts to about 110,000. In 1840 the number of free blacks in the State was 1,574, and in 1850 they numbered 2,618. They now number about 3,500.

The total colored population of the State is therefore less than 115,000, while the total white population cannot fall much, if any, below a million.

The only fruit of the Harper's Ferry *emeute* visible in Missouri, is the act to abolish free blacks, which passed the Legislature, but was vetoed by the Governor. The people are determined, however, that the act shall become a law in spite of the veto, and the next Legislature will doubtless pass the bill over the Governor's head.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

PETERBORO, N. H., Feb. 1, 1860.

This is a part of the Granite State in which the manufacturers of woolen goods have little to say. Some of them went down to Boston a few weeks since, and purchased a large amount of the raw material at a great wool gathering there had, and returned to Peterboro pretty well satisfied with their bargains. Mr. Joseph Noone, a prominent gentleman in this part of New Hampshire, so far as the manufacture of woolen goods and a gentle slice of politics are concerned, is among the prominent and influential citizens of the place. Peterboro is also the residence of ex-Gov. John H. Steele, who, whenever he speaks, means something. He has probably one of the strongest minds, even in his advanced age, that exists in New Hampshire. He keeps the run of politics nationally, and was never known to falter in the true national line. With such men it is a pleasure to talk. Every word they utter is a word of wisdom, and should be treasured as such by the rising men of this generation. Suppose we put a question to him.

Ques. What do the Republicans in your locality say about the John Brown affair?

Ans. (And we give the venerable old gentleman's words in full.) They now say that Brown was a monomaniac, demented, insane, crazy; but when the news first came that Brown had

invaded Virginia, captured the United States arsenal, armory, &c., the joy of many of them was illy concealed. Not a word was heard from any of them condemning, or even censuring him or his motives. On the contrary, there was not a little crowing and even exultation over the presumed cowardice of the Virginians. But as the facts became more and more known, and the motives better understood, those of the honest rank and file began to censure Brown, and now and then one expressed the opinion that Brown deserved the fate which evidently awaited him.

Q. But what did the leaders of the Black Republicans do ?

A. The leaders, or would-be leaders, were constantly inventing or propagating fallacious excuses for Brown's conduct ; and now and then one dared Virginia to enforce her laws—openly boasting that if she did, there would be increased converts to abolitionism.

Q. What did the Democrats do, then ?

A. The Democrats accused them of being accessory, either before or after the invasion, and of aiding and abetting treason, murder, arson and servile war.

Q. What was their answer ?

A. They in a measure shrank from the gulf which they had for years been so industriously and recklessly digging. It was then, and not till then, that we heard the stereotype plea of insanity. Not one word of hearty condemnation of the deed, but a manifest feverish desire to smooth the matter over, to hush it up.

Q. What do the Republicans now say ?

A. Now they are the most open-mouthed brawlers for State rights ; for not meddling with slavery in the States where it exists. Oh, no ! they are for living up to the requirements of the Constitution—all except the stealing of negroes, and the rendition of slaves.

Q. Do you think that the Republicans are sincere in condemning Brown and his acts?

A. I am satisfied that many, not all, of the Republicans regret that Brown did not succeed; and that every word of condemnation which we occasionally hear from such men is only from the lips outward.

Q. In your opinion, what will be the effect of the John Brown foray?

A. But one of two things may be safely predicted, namely, that the Southern people possess much more of the genuine principles of religion than do their calumniators and persecutors, thereby prompting them to forgive their enemies, and to do good to those who spitefully use them, or they will, as far as possible, cease to trade or buy from those who lose no opportunity to abuse them, and even steal their property.

Q. Suppose that course should widen the breach which now exists between the North and the South?

A. For one I should be loth to countenance, much less to recommend, a course by the South which would widen the breach that now so needlessly and unjustifiably exists between the North and the South. But is it reasonable even to hope that the state of things now existing should much longer exist, without the South entering into combinations to prevent all trade, and even intercourse, between the South and North?

Reporter—The Northern people consider themselves so powerful that the idea of a Southern confederacy is deemed preposterous by them.

Gov. Steele—I am well aware that so infatuated, so self-sufficient, has a large portion of the Northern people become, that they think and often express their belief that the South are much, if not entirely, dependent on the North even for a living. Nothing could be further from the facts; for while no reasonable man can doubt the fact that while there is a just

and manly intercourse between the North and South, they are mutually beneficial to each other, let me ask, what is it that the South receives from the North which they cannot procure elsewhere? Nothing, literally nothing. There is nothing I can now think of which the South receives from the North that cannot, and that, too, without much inconvenience, be obtained elsewhere; while, on the contrary, what does the North receive from the South, which she can well do without? It is needless to name more than one single article—cotton. Ask our numerous cotton manufacturers where they would procure their cotton, if not from the South?

Q. But suppose cotton should be raised elsewhere?

A. If the North should ask that question, the answer is readily at hand. Where is it or can it be had without slave labor so cheaply and in such quantities, and with such facilities, as from the South? One of the main fabrics that comprises the major part of the material which serves as garments for man, woman, child, and creatures of lesser dignity—which enters into almost every description of domestic cloth for domestic use—is more or less composed of cotton. Abolish free trade in cotton, and you will abolish our Northern cotton manufactories.

Q. Are there no other enterprises in which the North are interested that would be injured by a separation of the North and the South?

A. Yes. Turn to our shipowners. Ask them where they are to obtain their outward-bound freight for Europe, if they cannot get the cotton, rice, tobacco, &c., of the South? In short, the article of cotton is of equal, if not of more, importance to the North than to the South. By its use thousands of our population are fed and clothed, and through its agency the Northern commerce is not only sustained, but an advantage gained which enables our shipping interest to compete with the world.

The above are some of the views of the clear-headed Governor Steele in regard to some of the questions now pending—nationally. They are as well worthy of consideration as those of the lamented Silas Wright, of your State.

The people here feel that the national men will make large gains in the March election. The democrats are quite confident. One indication of a change in the sentiment of the people is that some of them have stopped the *New York Tribune* and are now taking the *New York Herald* and other liberal and intelligent papers, not excepting the democratic journals of the State.

Another word from a friend in this goodly town:—Straws show which way the wind blows. Every thing is working well. John Brown's illustration of Black Republicanism is not acceptable to some of the party here. He was their last and best trump, and the only man amongst them who had the courage to play their black disunion game—and he played it out for them. If it had not been for John Brown and the Helper atrocity, we should have had the abolitionist Sherman, Speaker of the House before this.

GEORGIA.

SAVANNAH, Jan. 31, 1860.

Yesterday I paid a visit to the rice plantation of Mr. S., on the Savannah river, a few miles above the city, and had the pleasure of being "toted" all over the place, and seeing a little negro life in Georgia. This part of the country is noted for the number and fertility of its rice plantations, the river here affording the planters excellent irrigation, besides being so convenient for transporting the crop to market. Mr. S. had about 250 acres under cultivation, which yield him a crop of about 7,000 bushels annually. When I arrived at the place a number of the negroes were engaged in burning the brush on

some unimproved lands near by, preparatory to planting, and what now appears to be a good for nothing looking waste, will, in the course of a few short months, be converted into a valuable estate. The workmen all appeared happy and contented, and were as comfortably clothed as you would wish to see them.

A short walk brought us to the "settlement," or habitations of the slaves, which were constructed in the usual manner, of pine boards neatly whitewashed, and elevated on piles some three or four feet above the surface of the ground. Near by was the overseer's house, the barn, workshop, and a number of outhouses, all forming quite a little village. Upon inquiring how much food it took to bring the negroes to such a state of perfection, Mr. S. informed me that the allowance per head was $3\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. of bacon a week, and as much bread and vegetables as they could eat. Occasionally a little molasses was added to the regular fare, and in the summer time they were freely supplied with milk. The fatter the bacon the more the negroes enjoyed it, and this was the case especially when there was much hard work to be done. It was the overseer's business to see that the cooking was properly done, and that the kitchen utensils were kept clean. The negroes were furnished with three suits of clothing every year, but frequently the children were obliged to have four. Each family was supplied with comfortable beds and bedding, and every inducement was held out to Sambo to abandon a weakness he has for sleeping on the bare floor. "It is a most difficult thing," said Mr. S., "to teach the negro the value and comfort of a good bed. Give him the bare floor and a wood fire to half toast his head, and he prefers it to the softest couch."

I noticed that there were no gardens attached to the cabins, and on asking the reason for their absence, Mr. S. replied that he was opposed to the system adopted on most plantations of

giving the negroes little patches to cultivate, on the ground that it tended to bring the slaves in connection with traders, who would supply them with liquor, and entice them to commit petty thefts and do all manner of wickedness. He preferred giving them a present of five or ten dollars each at Christmas rather than put up with the annoyance.

He had little trouble, he said, with the negroes, as far as sickness was concerned, the health of the entire settlement being excellent from one end of the year to the other. As for whipping, he seldom resorted to that mode of correction. The greatest punishment he could inflict upon an offender was to threaten him with New Orleans. The sugar plantations of Louisiana were terrible places in the estimation of his negroes, and the slightest threat to send any of them thither was far more effectual in securing obedience and respect than treating them to the lash. At noon he allows all his negroes to rest from half an hour to three hours, according to the season of the year. In spring time, for instance, when there is generally a good deal of heavy work to be performed, they were allowed only sufficient time to eat their dinners; but as the days grew longer, and the heat of the sun began to be oppressive, the resting spell was extended. In midsummer, when the heat is intense, the slaves were allowed three hours to rest, and an opportunity was afforded them to take a nap, which is found to be very refreshing and beneficial to the laborers, especially where the work is heavy. While engaged in the field they are supplied with fresh drinking water by one or two children appointed for that purpose, and on extra occasions they are treated to milk. When the day's work is done, some one in the gang strikes up a lively song, and they all proceed to their homes apparently as fresh and hearty as when they arose in the morning. Two or three times a month they get up a dance, and go through a cotillion and a reel as correctly as the

white folks at the North. There are always two or three musicians in the settlement, whose powers on the violin and banjo give them quite a position, and next to the preacher, perhaps they are the most respected and admired among their fellow workmen.

The *modus operandi* of converting wild swamp lands into fertile rice fields is certainly an interesting one, and deserves a brief notice at the hands of your correspondent. The work of digging canals, throwing up embankments and removing stumps having been performed, the negroes commence "chopping" or digging the soil. After "chopping" they proceed to "mashing" or levelling the clods of earth, and that work done, the rice is sown in rows about thirteen inches apart. Planting commences from the 20th of March to the 1st of April. The seed is covered over with a thin coat of earth, and at the next flood tide the water is admitted through the trunk, as it is called, and the field is slowly submerged. The floating weeds, etc., are then raked from the surface, and being placed on the embankment are there dried and burned. The water is allowed to remain on the field until the seed begins to shoot, generally from four to five days, and is then drained off. This is called the "sprout flow." After the plants appear above the ground about an inch or so, the water is let on again and allowed to remain on for from three to seven days. The plants by this time attain a height of three or four inches, and then the water is drained off. This is called the "point flow." The field is then allowed to remain dry until the plants are strong enough to bear hoeing, and the first and second hoeings having been gone through with, the field is again flooded. This is called the "long flow." Mr. S. says he allows the water at this stage to rise high above the rice, so as to prevent the floating weeds from entangling in the plants. The weeds having been all brought ashore, the water is gradually lowered

until the tops of the plants appear above the surface. The water is kept stationary at this point from ten to twenty days, according to the quality of the soil, and is then drawn off. The field is then allowed to dry, and then follows the third and fourth hoeings, care being taken to remove the weeds and volunteer rice. The water is then let on for the fourth time, and allowed to remain on until the rice is headed and the blossoms fall.

The harvest generally commences about the first week in September. When the reaping is determined upon, the water is all drawn off, and the following day the negroes enter the field with sickles, and in one day the crop is reaped and placed in little heaps upon the stubble. The next day the rice is tied up in sheaves and removed to the barn. The usual mode of transporting it from the field to the barn is upon the heads of the negroes; but in some plantations it is conveyed along the embankments in trucks contrived for the purpose. The harvesting of rice is excessively hard labor; even the negroes sometimes sink under it. As for white men performing the task, it is out of the question; the thing is physically impossible. The work of threshing is pursued at leisure, but harvesting is the work of forty-eight hours, and must be completed within that time, no matter how intense may be the heat of the sun or sultry the weather. The yield varies according to the quality of the soil from 800 to 1,500 pounds of rice to the acre. The land is held very high, some plantations being worth as much as \$200 an acre. The rice raised in this section of the country is acknowledged to be a very superior article, and commands the highest price in the market.

Planting in the open trench is a plan extensively pursued of late years, and the system has been found to work very well in some localities. The difference between planting in the open trench and planting in the manner previously described, consists in "claying" the seed and merging the "sprout" and the "point"

flows into one. Water thickened with clay is poured upon the seed until each grain receives a coating sufficient to prevent it from floating when the field is flooded. "Claying" answers all the purpose of covering the seed over with earth, and when the grain is sown in that way all the negroes have to do is to let on the water, and in ten or thirty days thereafter the seed begins to sprout. The water is kept on until the plants are one and a half to two inches high. The subsequent treatment is precisely similar to the other mode. The open trench plan has its advantages and disadvantages—its advantages in the saving of labor, protecting the rice from the depredations of birds and the injurious effects of freshets; and its disadvantages in promoting the growth of water grass, injuring the ditches, and washing away the embankments. The greatest enemies to the rice planter are the "freshes" and the "salts." In the one case from the great height of water in the river the planter is unable to drain his field properly, and in the other, from the stream being too low, the water from the ocean, which is poisonous to the cereal, finds its way up to the plantations, and thus suspends all flooding operations. Either of these disasters happening at a critical period, causes great loss and anxiety of mind to the planter.

Rice plantations are proverbial for their unhealthiness in the summer season. The owners seldom, if ever, reside upon them, but leave them in charge of overseers, who being acclimated to the soil, are alone able to withstand the deadly effects of the miasma. To be caught upon a rice plantation after nightfall is almost certain death to the unacclimated white man, but the negro passes through the ordeal unscathed. It seems as though Divine power had created the African especially to withstand the deadly atmosphere so peculiar to rice and cotton plantations, for without the physical qualifications afforded us in the negro, it would be impossible to successfully cultivate either of these great staples. Can it be reasonably supposed that the most

fertile and valuable soil in the Southern States was never intended for cultivation? Certainly not; these productive but pestilential lands, so eminently adapted for the growth of cotton and rice, were evidently intended by the Creator for the very purpose for which they are now used; and the white man could never have developed the boundless resources of those regions if by a dispensation of Providence he had not been blessed with negro slaves.

In my next letter I will give you an idea of how the slavery system works in the cities, and the condition of the negro in hotels, dwelling-houses and manufactories.

In most of the Southern cities, the negro men have a singular fancy for marrying wenches older than themselves. Cooks and washerwomen, old enough to be their mothers, are in their eyes the most suitable kind of wives, and are eagerly sought after. Negresses never despair of getting married in this country until after they have become aged enough to be grandmothers, so great and growing is the demand for old wives. Then there is an aristocracy in every city, and "sets" as numerous as among white people. The negroes of the millionaire seldom, if ever, associate or intermarry with the negroes of a man in humble circumstances, and if there is a party to be given, the poor white man's niggers are sure not to receive an invitation, so extremely select do they desire to keep the circle. Some of these parties, I am assured, are brilliant affairs, and incredible sums are spent in dress, jewelry, and the purchase of refreshments and delicacies of all kinds.

Negro churches and benevolent societies are common in every town. In Macon, there is a Baptist church which is attended regularly every Sunday by a congregation of over 1,500 persons. The preacher was formerly a slave, but his congregation purchased his freedom, bought him a house and gave him a salary of \$800 per annum, all of which he now enjoys. The reverend gentleman is represented as a very in-

telligent person, and is held in high estimation by the white residents of the city. A capital anecdote is told of old Barney, a negro servant belonging to the estate of Geo. Hargraves, in this city. Barney, it appears, accompanied his master to London and Paris on one occasion, in the capacity of body servant. Mr. Hargraves was an invalid, and having had one of his legs amputated, was obliged to take Barney with him everywhere he went. During their stay at London, a number of abolitionists hearing that Barney was a slave, took occasion to impress upon the mind of the negro the absurdity of his accompanying Mr. Hargraves back to the United States.

"Well, what will you do for me," inquires Barney, "if I stay with you?"

"Why, we will get you employment at a shilling a day, and you will have your liberty. Think of that!"

"No," said Barney, with a shake of the head. "I guess it wouldn't pay. You see, I am just as well off as my master. I eat as good food as he eats, dress about as well, and have plenty of money; and what do you think I do for all that? Why, black one boot."

The abolitionists found they could not make a convert of Barney, and left him in disgust. Barney is still alive, and enjoys a handsome annuity left him by his old master.

The free negroes in this State number about 4,000. As a general thing, they are a steady, sober, and industrious people, and strong advocates of the slavery system. One of them, a fellow named Joe Clark, residing in this city, is himself the owner of some ten or twelve slaves, whom he employs upon a cotton plantation. Another, named Isham Cooper, keeper of a bar-room, is estimated to be worth over \$30,000; and I heard of a third one who now supports the family of his former master. He was manumitted several years ago, it

appears, and made quite a competence by bridge building. Since then, his former master has been several times indebted to him for various amounts, exceeding in the aggregate, probably, some three or four thousand dollars. And even now, as I said before, he is the main contributor to the support of a white man's family. These negroes are highly respected by the white population, and any injury or wrong practiced upon them, would entail as sure and speedy punishment to the offender, as though the most respectable slaveholders were the aggrieved parties.

Yesterday, I saw two of the Africans who were brought over in the yacht *Wanderer*, and fine, intelligent-looking fellows they are, too. One of them is named Mingo, and the other, George. They are employed in a livery stable in Oglethorpe street, and make good hostlers. George has charge of twelve horses, and promises to be a smart and capable slave. They talk tolerably good English, and display wonderful cuteness for boys of 16 years of age. They are similar in appearance to the other negroes about the place, and display none of those savage traits of character that one might be led to expect, considering they were so recently imported. I understand there are a number of other Africans, brought over by the same vessel, on a plantation not far from this city, and that their owner calculates on making them excellent field hands. Certainly, the specimens I saw yesterday were very promising youths.

From the correspondence of the *N. Y. Herald* it will be perceived that the free laborers in the North are not a bit better off than the slaves in the South, \$4 per week being the average wages earned by the Northern mechanics.

We now return to Mr. Helper again. He says:—

“In this extraordinary crisis of affairs, no man can be a true patriot without first becoming an Abolitionist. (A Free-soiler is only a tadpole in an advanced state of transformation; an Abolitionist is the full and perfectly developed frog.)” P. 116.

Mr. Helper only states above what we have asserted in the beginning of this work, that the “**Black Republicans**” *have passed the stage of “transformation,”* and are now Abolitionists in full communion; for the Republican members of Congress endorsed the above when they endorsed the book. And they have never since repudiated it, and still stand by it, as will be seen by the following letter:—

“WASHINGTON CITY, FEB. 5, 1860.

“*To the Editor of the Ashtabula Sentinel:*

“Our friends at home should be slow to censure their representatives for deserting Mr. Sherman. They did so for the purpose of electing a speaker, and defeating a party that has long wielded the federal power to the support of slavery. They felt the humiliation of discarding a candidate because he had endorsed the doctrine of Helper’s book, *every sentence of which finds a response in the hearts of all true Republicans.* JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS.”

There—let it no longer be said “that Republicans repudiate Helper.” The prophet has spoken.

Mr. Helper also goes on to show the high price that Northern lands sell, and the low price Southern lands sell for, and ascribes the low prices of Southern lands to the “institution” of slavery.

A writer in the *Southern Cultivator* makes the following references to this important subject.

“There are four causes of exhaustion to our soils, and, consequently, of lessening their value, viz. :

1st. Our long, hot summers. *

2nd. Our heavy, washing rains of winter.

3rd. The things cultivated.

4th. The mode of cultivation.

The first three of these causes are governed by the laws of nature : consequently, the institution of “African slavery” cannot change them. As to the fourth, our observation has shown us that, in the thinly or newly settled free States, the mode of cultivation is as impoverishing,—in Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, etc.—as it is in the slave States. It is population that gives value to land ; and our population has received its great augmentation from foreign immigration, which has mostly landed on New England or free State shores, and have taken their bias and direction from those whom they first came in contact with : consequently, the majority of this great influx of population,—having left a land of tyranny and oppression,—are easily prejudiced against the Southern States, which are represented as being a land of slavery,—which is inimical to their interest ; therefore they settle down in the Northern or non-slaveholding States, thus swelling population, which increases the demand for land, and that, as a reasonable cause, increases its value. Lands adjacent to the cities of Baltimore, Md., and St. Louis, Mo., and New Orleans,

La., all of which have slaves, sell for as high prices, in proportion to their population, as the land near Boston, New York, Philadelphia or Cincinnati; conclusively showing that it is population, and not the peculiar institution of slavery, that governs the prices of land.

That population increases more rapidly at the North and in the non-slaveholding States, is a fact which we do not pretend to deny; yet, we claim that undue advantages are taken, and misrepresentations made, to produce it.

Aid Immigrant Agencies have been vigilant at the North, for the double purpose of extorting money from the foreign emigrant, and, also, to inoculate them with abolitionism, and prejudice them against the South and her institutions. This is the true cause why the South has not increased more rapidly in her population; and, as a consequence, the low price of her lands,—if, indeed, there really does exist any very great disparity in the price of land North and South, when you come to a general comparison of valuation.

CHAPTER VII.

The Declaration of Independence quoted to prove the Negro was not Born, "Created Free and Equal," with the White Man—Judge Taney's Decision in the Dred Scott Case quoted to prove the Author's assertions.

MR. HELPER quotes the "Declaration of Independence" to substantiate his asseration that the negro was "created free and equal with the white man. In reply to this, we will only quote what Chief Justice Taney says, in his opinion on the "Dred Scott Decision," to be found on pages 15, 16 and 17 of the printed opinions by Congress. Says Judge Taney:

The language of the Declaration of Independence is conclusive.

It begins by declaring that, "when in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle them, a decent respect for the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."

It then proceeds to say: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among them is life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to se-

cure these rights, governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The general words above quoted would seem to embrace the whole human family, and if they were used in a similar instrument at this day, would be so understood. But it is too clear for dispute, that the enslaved African race were not intended to be included, and formed no part of the people who framed and adopted this declaration; for if the language, as understood in that day, would embrace them, the conduct of the distinguished men who framed the Declaration of Independence would have been utterly and flagrantly inconsistent with the principles they asserted; and instead of the sympathy of mankind, to which they so confidently appealed, they would have deserved and received universal rebuke and reprobation.

Yet the men who framed this declaration were great men—high in literary acquirements—high in their sense of honor, and incapable of asserting principles inconsistent with those on which they were acting. They perfectly understood the meaning of the language they used, and how it would be understood by others; and they knew that it would not in any part of the civilized world be supposed to embrace the negro race, which, by common consent, had been excluded from civilized governments and the family of nations, and doomed to slavery. They spoke and acted according to the then established doctrines and principles, and in the ordinary language of the day, and no one misunderstood them. The unhappy black race were separated from the white by indelible marks and laws long before established, and were never thought of or spoken of except as property, and when the claims of the owner or the profit of the trader were supposed to need protection.

This state of public opinion had undergone no change when the Constitution was adopted, as is equally evident from its provisions and language.

The brief preamble sets forth by whom it was formed, for

what purposes, and for whose benefit and protection. It declares that it is formed by the *people* of the United States; that is to say, by those who were members of the different political communities in the several States; and its great object is declared to be to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity. It speaks in general terms of the *people* of the United States, and of *citizens* of the several States, when it is providing for the exercise of the powers granted or the privileges secured to the citizen. It does not define what description of persons are intended to be included under these terms, or who shall be regarded as a citizen and one of the people. It uses them as terms so well understood, that no further description or definition was necessary.

But there are two clauses in the Constitution which point directly and specifically to the negro race as a separate class of persons, and show clearly that they were not regarded as a portion of the people or citizens of the Government then formed.

One of these clauses reserves to each of the thirteen States the right to import slaves until the year 1808, if it thinks proper. And the importation which it thus sanctions was unquestionably of persons of the race of which we are speaking, as the traffic in slaves in the United States had always been confined to them. And by the other provision the States pledge themselves to each other to maintain the right of property of the master, by delivering up to him any slave who may have escaped from his service, and be found within their respective territories. By the first above-mentioned clause, therefore, the right to purchase and hold this property is directly sanctioned and authorized for twenty years by the people who framed the Constitution. And by the second, they pledge themselves to maintain and uphold the right of the master in the manner specified, as long as the Government they then formed should endure. And these two provisions show, con-

clusively, that neither the description of persons therein referred to, nor their descendants, were embraced in any of the other provisions of the Constitution ; for certainly these two clauses were not intended to confer on them or their posterity the blessings of liberty, or any of the personal rights so carefully provided for the citizen.

No one of that race had ever migrated to the United States voluntarily ; all of them had been brought here as articles of merchandise. The number that had been emancipated at that time were but few in comparison with those held in slavery ; and they were identified in the public mind with the race to which they belonged, and regarded as a part of the slave population rather than the free. It is obvious that they were not even in the minds of the framers of the Constitution when they were conferring special rights and privileges upon the citizens of a State in every other part of the Union.

Indeed, when we look to the condition of this race in the several States at the time, it is impossible to believe that these rights and privileges were intended to be extended to them.

It is very true, that in that portion of the Union where the labor of the negro race was found to be unsuited to the climate and unprofitable to the master, but few slaves were held at the time of the Declaration of Independence ; and when the Constitution was adopted, it had entirely worn out in one of them, and measures had been taken for its gradual abolition in several others. But this change had not been produced by any change of opinion in relation to this race ; but because it was discovered, from experience, that slave labor was unsuited to the climate and productions of these States ; for some of the States, where it had ceased or nearly ceased to exist, were actively engaged in the slave trade, procuring cargoes on the coast of Africa, and transporting them for sale to those parts of the Union where their labor was found to be profitable, and suited to the climate and productions. And this traffic was openly

carried on, and fortunes accumulated by it, without reproach from the people of the States where they resided. And it can hardly be supposed that, in the States where it was then countenanced in its worst form—that is, in the seizure and transportation—the people could have regarded those who were emancipated as entitled to equal rights with themselves.

And we may here again refer, in support of this proposition, to the plain and unequivocal language of the laws of the several States, some passed after the Declaration of Independence and before the Constitution was adopted, and some since the Government went into operation.

We need not refer, on this point, particularly to the laws of the present slaveholding States. Their statute books are full of provisions in relation to this class, in the same spirit with the Maryland law which we have before quoted. They have continued to treat them as an inferior class, and to subject them to strict police regulations, drawing a broad line of distinction between the citizen and the slave races, and legislating in relation to them upon the same principle which prevailed at the time of the Declaration of Independence. As relates to these States, it is too plain for argument, that they have never been regarded as a part of the people or citizens of the State, nor supposed to possess any political rights which the dominant race might not withhold or grant at their pleasure. And as long ago as 1822, the Court of Appeals of Kentucky decided that free negroes and mulattoes were not citizens within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States; and the correctness of this decision is recognized, and the same doctrine affirmed, in 1 Meigs's Tenn. Reports, 331.

And if we turn to the legislation of the States where slavery had worn out, or measures taken for its speedy abolition, we shall find the same opinions and principles equally fixed and equally acted upon.

Thus, Massachusetts, in 1786, passed a law similar to the colonial one of which we have spoken. The law of 1786, like the law of 1705, forbids the marriage of any white person with any negro, Indian, or mulatto, and inflicts a penalty of fifty pounds upon any one who shall join them in marriage; and declares all such marriages absolutely null and void, and degrades thus the unhappy issue of the marriage by fixing upon it the stain of bastardy. And this mark of degradation was renewed, and again impressed upon the race, in the careful and deliberate preparation of their revised code published in 1836. This code forbids any person from joining in marriage any white person with any Indian, negro, or mulatto, and subjects the party who shall offend in this respect, to imprisonment, not exceeding six months, in the common jail, or to hard labor, and to a fine of not less than fifty nor more than two hundred dollars; and, like the law of 1786, it declares the marriage to be absolutely null and void. It will be seen that the punishment is increased by the code upon the person who shall marry them, by adding imprisonment to a pecuniary penalty.

So, too, in Connecticut. We refer more particularly to the legislation of this State, because it was not only among the first to put an end to slavery within its own territory, but was the first to fix a mark of reprobation upon the African slave trade. The law last mentioned was passed in October, 1788, about nine months after the State had ratified and adopted the present Constitution of the United States; and by that law it prohibited its own citizens, under severe penalties, from engaging in the trade, and declared all policies of insurance on the vessel or cargo made in the State to be null and void. But, up to the time of the adoption of the Constitution, there is nothing in the legislation of the State indicating any change of opinion as to the relative rights and position of the white and black races in this country, or indicating that it meant to place the latter, when free, upon a level with its citizens. And

certainly nothing which would have led the slaveholding States to suppose that Connecticut designed to claim for them, under the new Constitution, the equal rights and privileges and rank of citizens in every other State.

The first step taken by Connecticut upon this subject was as early as 1774, when it passed an act forbidding the further importation of slaves into the State. But the section containing the prohibition is introduced by the following preamble :

“And whereas the increase of slaves in this State is injurious to the poor, and inconvenient.”

This recital would appear to have been carefully introduced, in order to prevent any misunderstanding of the motives which induced the Legislature to pass the law, and places it distinctly upon the interest and convenience of the white population—excluding the inference that it might have been intended in any degree for the benefit of the other.

And in the act of 1784, by which the issue of slaves, born after the time therein mentioned, were to be free at a certain age, the section is again introduced by a preamble assigning a similar motive for the act. It is in these words :

“Whereas sound policy requires that the abolition of slavery should be effected as soon as may be consistent with the rights of individuals, and the public safety and welfare”—showing that the right of property in the master was to be protected, and that the measure was one of policy, and to prevent the injury and inconvenience, to the whites, of a slave population in the State.

And still further pursuing its legislation, we find that in the same statute passed in 1774, which prohibited the further importation of slaves into the State, there is also a provision by which any negro, Indian, or mulatto servant, who was found wandering out of the town or place to which he belonged, without a written pass such as therein described, was made liable to be seized by any one, and taken before the next authority to

be examined and delivered up to his master—who was required to pay the charge which had accrued thereby. And a subsequent section of the same law provides, that if any free negro shall travel without such pass, and shall be stopped, seized, or taken up, he shall pay all charges arising thereby. And this law was in full operation when the Constitution of the United States was adopted, and was not repealed till 1797. So that up to that time free negroes and mulattoes, were associated with servants and slaves in the police regulations established by the laws of the State.

And again, in 1833, Connecticut passed another law, which made it penal to set up or establish any school in that State for the instruction of persons of the African race not inhabitants of the State, or to instruct or teach in any such school or institution, or board or harbor for that purpose, any such person, without the previous consent in writing of the civil authority of the town in which such school or institution might be.

The legislation of the States therefore shows, in a manner not to be mistaken, the inferior and subject condition of that race at the time the Constitution was adopted, and long afterward, throughout the thirteen States, by which that instrument was framed: and it is hardly consistent with the respect due to these States, to suppose that they regarded at that time, as fellow-citizens and members of the sovereignty, a class of beings whom they had thus stigmatized; whom, as we are bound, out of respect to the State sovereignties, to assume they had deemed it just and necessary thus to stigmatize, and upon whom they had impressed such deep and enduring marks of inferiority and degradation; or, that when they met in convention to form the Constitution, they looked upon them as a portion of their constituents, or designed to include them in the provisions so carefully inserted for the security and protection of the liberties and rights of their citizens. It cannot be supposed that they intended to secure to them rights and privileges, and rank, in

the new political body, throughout the Union, which every one of them denied within the limits of its own dominion. More especially, it cannot be believed that the large slaveholding States regarded them as included in the word citizens, or would have consented to a Constitution which might compel them to receive them in that character from another State. For if they were so received, and entitled to the privileges and immunities of citizens, it would exempt them from the operation of the special laws and from the police regulations which they considered to be necessary for their own safety. It would give to persons of the negro race, who were recognized as citizens in any one State of the Union, the right to enter every other State, whenever they pleased, singly or in companies, without pass or passport, and without obstruction, to sojourn there as long as they pleased, to go where they pleased at every hour of the day or night without molestation, unless they committed some violation of the law for which a white man would be punished; and it would give them the full liberty of speech in public and in private upon all subjects upon which its own citizens might speak; to hold public meetings upon political affairs, and to keep and carry arms wherever they went. And all of this would be done in the face of the subject race of the same color, both free and slaves, and inevitably producing discontent and insubordination among them, and endangering the peace and safety of the State.

It is impossible, it would seem, to believe that the great men of the slaveholding States, who took so large a share in framing the Constitution of the United States, and exercised so much influence in procuring its adoption, could have been so forgetful or regardless of their own safety and the safety of those who trusted and confided in them.

CHAPTER VIII.

Northern Testimony in regard to the Aggressions of the Republican Party against the South—Extracts from the Speeches of the Hon. J. A. Logan and Stephen A. Douglas—The Damage inflicted upon the Northern Merchants and Manufacturers by the Republican Party—The Proofs—The South in favor of Disunion in certain Contingencies—Eloquent Defence of the South, by Hon. Horatio G. Seymour, of New York, and Col. J. W. Wall, of New Jersey.

WE take the following extract from a speech of Hon. J. A. Logan, of Illinois, delivered in the House of Representatives, December 9, 1859.

“Look upon both sides of this hall, and what do we behold? On the right, seats occupied by Republicans, representing purely a Northern and sectional party; when the list of members is called, you hear not the voice of a Republican answering from the land of Washington, who led our armies through the Revolution to victory, giving us free institutions, peace, prosperity, and happiness as a great nation. No voice from the land of Jefferson, who penned the Declaration of Independence. No voice from the land of Madison, who drafted the Constitution now attempted to be destroyed by their prejudices and fanaticism. No voice from the land of Jackson, who restored the glory of the American arms after they had been disgraced at the North!”

We also quote an extract from a speech of Hon. Stephen A. Douglas, delivered in the Senate of the United States, January 23, 1860:—

“I have always noted that those men who were so far off from the slave States that they did not know any thing about them, are most anxious for the fate of the poor slave. Those men who are so far off that they do not know what a negro is, are distressed to death about the condition of the poor negro. But, sir, go into the border States, where we associate across the line, where the civilities of society are constantly interchanged, where we trade with each other, and have social and commercial intercourse, and there you will find them standing by each other like a band of brothers. Take Southern Illinois, Southern Indiana, Southern Ohio, and that part of Pennsylvania bordering on Maryland, and there you will find social intercourse, commercial intercourse, good feeling,—because those people know the condition of the slave on the opposite side of the line; but just in proportion as you recede from the slave States, just in proportion as the people are ignorant of the facts,—just in that proportion,—party leaders can impose on their sympathies and honest prejudices.”

Again, says this distinguished Senator:—

“Slavery may be very essential in one climate, and totally useless in another. If I were a citizen of Louisiana, I would vote for retaining and maintaining slavery, because I believe the good of that people would require it. As a citizen of Illinois, I am utterly opposed to it, because our interests would not be promoted by it. I should like to see the Abolitionist who would go and live in a Southern country, that would not get over his scruples very soon, and have a plantation as quickly as he could get the money to buy it.

I have said, and repeat, that this question of slavery is one of climate, of political economy, of self-interest,—not a ques-

tion of legislation. Wherever the climate, the soil, the health of the country are such that it cannot be cultivated by white labor, you will have African labor, and compulsory labor at that. Wherever white labor can be employed cheapest and most profitably, there African labor will retire and white labor will take its place."

The *Philadelphia Atlas* of January 29, 1860, says, on the threatened non-intercourse between the South and North:—

"We are not at all surprised that, under the influence of the present excitement, the South should seriously consider the propriety of doing its own exportation and importation. The concentration of so large a portion of the material wealth of this country in the Northern States,—their more rapid progress in the arts,—is not entirely attributable to the superiority of free over slave labor. The criminal negligence of our Southern friends in extending their commerce, and building up their manufactures, and their lavish expenditures of money for the sole profit of the Northern merchant and manufacturer, will largely account for the disparity between the two sections in wealth and power.

We not only export their cotton, rice, sugar and tobacco, and realize a very handsome profit thereon, but we import nearly all their costly goods, and supply them with the products of our factories at such prices as we please to charge them. Our literary and scientific institutions are mainly supported by Southern patrons. Our watering places and mountain retreats are crowded in the hot summer months with the gay mothers and daughters of the sunny South.

Now suppose that our brothers south of Mason and Dixon's should discontinue this profitable intercourse, what then? Why the New England fanatics would pale with terror, and the North would appreciate the folly, not to say the criminality, of intermeddling with other people's business.

This is no impossible thing. Indeed, we think it much more probable than a dissolution of the Union. For we can well conceive the vast benefit of the one, and the disastrous consequences of the other movement to the South. There would be a heroism in this, a madness and ruin in that. This would be worthy of a brave, indignant, patriotic, and independent people,—that would be the act of rashness and folly.

Why should not New Orleans, Mobile, Charleston, Norfolk and Baltimore become rivals of Boston, New York and Philadelphia, if the Southern patronage should be transferred thither? We would have no right to complain at this. Our people have wantonly provoked the South. We tolerate men in our midst who are ever warring on the South, stealing negroes, and counseling insurrection. A squeamish sentimentalism about slavery is the prevailing type of Northern idiosyncrasy. Many of our people disregard the Constitution, and are ready to trample it in the dust, rather than that the negro should remain in that condition, in which he appears to thrive very well, for a single day. No allowance is made for the difficulties in which the question of emancipation is involved. And these people totally forget that they have no right to interfere with the question, unless they are prepared to pay for the negro's freedom, and his master is willing to sell him. They foolishly expect to coerce the Southern people to adopt their views of slavery, and under the promptings of an awakened conscience, to uproot their social fabric, and forever impoverish themselves and their posterity.

So long as these views are freely expressed in private and public by the press, and from our pulpits, is it strange that the South should be excited, or that her people should determine to deal elsewhere, and depend more upon their own resources?

Instead of passing personal liberty bills, and obstructing the execution of the federal laws; instead of organizing a party to exclude, by Congressional enactments, our Southern brothers

from the common territories of the Union, we were to provide means for punishing treason, and maintaining the laws, we would be acting wisely and patriotically, and would restore that fraternal feeling which characterized the early days of the Republic.

Let our business men look at this question, and unite in bringing about a healthy reaction in the North. After all that has been said in Congress and out of it, the difficulty may be resolved into a question of dollars and cents. The Northern manufacturer wants to obtain possession of the Government in order to prostitute its power for his special protection. The tariff, although supposed to be a bygone issue, is yet at the bottom of this contest. The negro is made the hobby of both sections, because he represents that species of labor which does not come in competition with foreign labor, and because he is the object of special regard and sympathy by a large class of diseased philanthropists."

The chief organ of Seward in the North charges the Democracy of the South with being a disunion party,—a charge which has been often made of late, and reiterated *usque ad nauseam*. This charge is, to a certain extent, undoubtedly true, and ought to be admitted. It is true conditionally—true in a certain contingency, which may or may not happen. The universal sentiment, not only of the Democracy of the South, but of the whole South, is, that in the event of the anti-slavery parties of the North gaining the ascendant in the Federal Government, the wisest policy of the Southern communities is to secede peaceably from the Union, before a tyrant majority in Congress proceeds to reduce them to a base subjection,

which would place them in the position of conquered provinces, instead of independent sovereign States. This has been proclaimed by the leading men of the South in both houses of Congress, declared in their State Legislatures and by the Governors of States, enunciated by the people in their mass meetings, and by their presses, from Delaware to Texas.

Now this is an alarming condition of things, tending directly to the breaking up of the Union; and the question is, What cause has produced these dire effects? We answer, that thirty years of anti-slavery agitation at the North has at last culminated in a crisis which has driven the South to the wall, and compels it to stand at bay. A moral war has been waged against its institutions, which are guaranteed by the Constitution, protected by the Constitution, and incorporated into the very framework of the Constitution. Garrison and Phillips are undoubtedly right, and honest as they are right, when they pronounce the Constitution "pro-slavery." It is pro-slavery, and therefore they curse it, and curse the Union of which it is the bond. The moral war against the institutions of the South has proceeded step by step till at length it has become a physical war,—a war of saltpetre and brimstone, and rifles and pikes,—of which the saint and martyr John Brown is the pioneer, and of which Helper's Compendium, endorsed by all the leading men of the Republican party, is the law and gospel. William H. Seward, who has given this book a special endorsement, is the prophet of the

party, who, like Mahomet, with the Koran in one hand and a sword in the other, issues his declaration of war against the South, threatening to subject its institutions to a higher law, (a new book of Mormon;) and his disciple, Mr. Hickman, of Pennsylvania, follows up the menace of the "irrepressible conflict," of which there was a foretaste at Harper's Ferry, by another menace that the higher law will be forced upon the South by eighteen millions of bayonets; and the man who is at the head of this party, William H. Seward, is its candidate for the Chief Magistracy, which would place at his disposal, and at their disposal, the Federal army and navy, and the militia of the several States.

Has not the South, then, reason to fear the worst in the event of the triumph of the anti-slavery party, and the election of William H. Seward? And is it not natural that the South should meditate and threaten secession from a Union which would no longer exist but on parchment, and which would be henceforth only the union of the shark with his prey? The Harper's Ferry invasion may be explained away, but the South will regard the election of Mr. Seward as the palpable, incontrovertible, overt act of the whole North, foreshadowing the other overt acts in his programme. It will regard his election by a Northern majority and a sectional issue as the first act of disunion committed by the combined Northern States, and it will consider itself as absolved before God and man from all future allegiance to the Union. Judging

from the best information we have received from every State in the South, our solemn conviction is that, if Mr. Seward should be elected, or any other man who adopts the programme of his "irrepressible conflict," he will never be inaugurated at the Capitol in Washington.

The causes which are precipitating this terrible catastrophe are the same which have led to similar results in all other countries. Take, for instance, the case of England and her North American colonies. What produced their revolt? It was the oppression of the mother country, which attempted by a high hand to interfere with the legislation of the colonial Assemblies and to ignore the rights of the people. They remonstrated in vain, and at last threatened. The leaders who gave expression to their menaces were then called disunionists, traitors, and rebels. Undoubtedly they were disloyal, and disloyalty at last became patriotism, and success justified and sanctified the Revolution. What produced the disunion, disloyalty, and Revolution? The tyranny of the British Government, which, because it had the power, oppressed its weak colonies, and broke the political compact. In the same way, the anti-slavery party have become a majority in the North, and control its elections and resources; and they abuse their power by nullifying the Constitution of the United States, and breaking the compact—the solemn league and covenant into which all the States entered at the time of the Union; and the Northern States repudiate their obligations, and say they will not restore fugitive

slaves, though commanded by the Constitution and the laws of Congress, and that they will not permit any more slave States, which is in direct violation of the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and in defiance of the history of the country, from the foundation of the Government, during which nine slave States have been admitted. And if they get possession and control of the Federal Government, they plainly declare they will carry out their ideas with force and arms, fire and sword. Here is the cause of the disunion at the South, where ten States have already "pronounced."

What, then, is the duty of the conservatives of the Middle States—all who detest perfidy, covenant-breaking, and "Carthaginian faith"—all our merchants and manufacturers, and all who have an interest in the continuance of the Union? Their plain duty is to unite, put down the anti-slavery agitation, declare their intention to render the South the justice due to it by the terms of the bond, and, as the best evidence of their sincerity, rally around and elect a man to the Presidency who will faithfully carry out this policy. Then, and not till then, will the disunion party cease to exist at the South; but if the solemn warnings given by the signs of the times are disregarded, and if the anti-slavery sentiment is permitted to gain the ascendancy next fall, then we shall, soon find, not merely threats of disunion at the South, but disunion itself, and the dissolution of the greatest and best political confederacy the world ever saw.

There are many true patriots in the North, as will be seen by the following eloquent defense of the South, made by the Hon. Horatio G. Seymour, of New York.

When our fathers, on common battle-fields, were struggling for common rights, slavery existed in all our colonies ; there was no exception ; it was on every rood of ground. We had no difficulty on account of slavery, then, in achieving our independence. But since that time slavery has been abolished over more than half of this land of ours. It is now in comparatively contracted limits, and now we hear that it must lead to alienation, or the disruption of this great confederacy. I fear that we of the North are unjust, and not altogether courageous, in our treatment to our brethren of the South. How came slavery in these United States ? Who brought the negro from Africa ? The South never had ships. The men of New York, where I came from, the men of Massachusetts, and the men of Rhode Island, were those who stole them from their homes and brought them over to the shambles here. Who laid the foundations of slavery which underlie the institutions of many of our States ? The time was when, over the whole length and breadth of this land of ours, the people did not recognize the black man as having any political rights. Now, my friends, that is just as true of Massachusetts as of South Carolina, and Judge Taney, in so stating, merely stated a historical fact and known to be so by every student of history. The other day, in looking over papers which came into my hands, I found an original document, a bill of sale for a slave from a man in Massachusetts to a Man in New York, and that paper throws a most remarkable light over the whole question of slavery. It commenced thus : "To all Christian people to whom these presents may come, I, Mark Rose, sell my slave," &c. The people of Massachusetts held that no persons were entitled to any political privileges unless they were Christians ;

and they went further than that—they held that no one was entitled to political privileges unless he was the right kind of a Christian. They held the views which laid the foundation of slavery in the theology of that time. They sold Quakers into slavery—they sold the family of King Philip into slavery. These were the sentiments that existed in the North in our early days. When the Constitution of the United States was formed, and when the delegates from the different States met in convention, the question of slavery was there, and it was asked, when shall the slave trade be put an end to? Georgia says, now; Virginia says, now; South Carolina says, not yet; Connecticut, not yet; Rhode Island, not yet; Massachusetts, not yet; New Hampshire said not yet—the slave trade is profitable. If you will read Minot's History of Massachusetts, you will learn that the great business of New England was at one time the manufacture of rum—pure rum; and when they made rum, they took it to the coast of Africa and exchanged it for slaves. The slavers landed their cargoes on some unfrequented shores of the Southern coast, and forthwith the entire South was charged with complicity in the slave trade. But they do not, at the same time, tell you, that the slave ships are fitted out from New England ports—that they glide out to sea upon their nefarious voyages beneath the shades of Bunker Hill.

The political power of our country is in the hands of the free States. The population of the country increases at the rate of a million a year; of this increase the North receives over seven hundred thousand. This large majority of the yearly increase has given the North her strength in the confederacy. How came the North by this excess of the increase. At the outset we were equal—then we were all slave States. Now, what led to the abolishment of slavery in the North, and thus gave us the basis of our present strength? I will tell you, my friends, and you all know it to be so. The Democratic party party, under Jefferson, inaugurated the wise and beneficent

policy of inviting the laborer of the old world to plant himself down upon the great and fertile plains of our country.

Under this policy, the emigrants from Europe flocked to the Northern States, because they found in their soil and climate, and in their institutions, a more congenial home. So you see, my friends, that it has been under a policy inaugurated by Southern statesmen—a policy which found its most bitter opponents at the North—that our section has become all powerful in the government. We have now a majority in the Senate, in the House of Representatives, and in the Electoral College; but the census of 1860 will show that two-thirds of the members of the House of Representatives, and an overwhelming majority in the Senate, represent free States. Is this a time, and are these the circumstances under which an “irrepressible conflict” shall be waged against the people and institutions of the weaker section? When the South was strong and we were weak, they furnished us no precedent for the course of action we now propose to pursue against them. These being the truths which history teaches, and standing here as I do, at the very head waters of the mighty Mississippi, whose arms lock our country together, teaching us a perpetual lesson of fraternal love and union, I beg you to pause before you enter upon a sectional warfare, which will rive asunder those whom God has joined together.

Before you do this, look at history, and see if the South has ever hesitated to uphold a single measure which was calculated to advance the whole country; although in doing so they have built up the North instead of the South. There is an instinctive difference between the two parties. The Democratic party is a let-alone party—the Republican party is a meddling party. It is a great deal easier to obtain political power by inflaming the passions and prejudices of our neighbors, by denouncing men a thousand miles away, than it is to gain influence by governing our walk in life by the principles of justice, or the dic-

tates of a sound patriotism. Is it not too true that the reverse of this has been hurtful to the morals of our people—and hurtful to the pulpit, of which I speak with all reverence, and to the holy doctrines which should issue from the sacred desk? Is it not too true, my Republican friends, that a rifle for Kansas or a curse for the South has weighed more in the political scale than private virtues or political service? Whence comes slavery? We have seen who prolonged it. Now, my friends, do you ever stop to inquire who upholds it? It is sustained by the firm of “Weaver, Wearer & Planter,” and two of the partners live up North. Every one knows that but for the looms of New England and Old England it could not live a day. The loudest denunciations against slavery are made by men with cotton shirts on their back. The most fervent pulpit exhortations against slavery come from men who wrap themselves for repose at night in cotton sheets, who lay their heads upon cotton pillows, and go to sleep thanking God that they are better than the men “down South.” I was called upon some years ago, while Governor of New York, by a deputation of Quakers from Great Britain, to lay before me a “testimony” against slavery. As they wished, I listened to them. We afterward fell into a conversation, and the question arose why the people of Europe were oppressed and burdened so heavily by taxation. We attributed it to the differences in their language—the great number of nationalities, divided by imaginary lines—the petty jealousies and strifes, and consequent necessity for maintaining large standing armies. We then spoke of the blest condition of Europe if all these rival governments could be moulded into one, speaking a common language, having common sympathies, with no custom-houses to annoy, and no standing armies to threaten; and my Quaker friends warmed with enthusiasm at the glorious picture, and expressed the earnest wish that such a day might dawn, for with it would come the true millennium. “But,” said I, “when all this has been

asciended, suppose some man should rise up in England, and say that all this genial fellowship among the nations, this community of interest and of language shall be destroyed unless serfdom shall be abrogated in Russia and polygamy in Turkey, what would you say regarding such a man?" "Say," said the Quakers; "we would say that he deserved the anathemas of all good men, as a traitor to the best interests of mankind for doubting that God, in his own way, and in his own good time, would work out a remedy for all these wrongs!" "Now," said I, "my friends, when we drew this picture of Europe it was not all fancy. I described the broad land which extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific—from the great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. Go two thousand miles over this land, and no custom-house shall stop you—travel to its furthest limits and you shall see no standing armies—you shall hear a common language and shall feel a common sympathy. Then you shall know what it is to live upon a great broad continent where there is brotherhood unalloyed by your hatreds and antipathies. Why, therefore, do you come here to teach us the language of strife?"

Now, my friends, to make the application:—Had we, from the beginning, been arrayed one State against another—had we disregarded our community of language and of interest, and fostered the hatreds and jealousies which we are now taught to cherish, this beautiful Minnesota would yet have been a wilderness, the painted savages would yet glide down the noble Mississippi, and the waters of that mighty cataract, whose thunders I almost hear, that by the art of man has been taught to leap forth to their labors at the rising of the sun and retire to their rest at its setting, would still pursue their precipitous course undisturbed.

Said Colonel James W. Wall, to the citizens of Newark, on the 5th November, 1859:—

Keep up "this irrepressible conflict between freedom and

slavery," predicted and prayed for by the leading Republican agitators of the North, and I tell you the time is not far distant, yea, it is at our very doors, when the agonized cry shall come up from Southern hearthstones made desolate, and from fields crimsoned with the blood of master and of slave, for vengeance, dire vengeance, upon that miserable faction who fed this flame of sectional strife until its lurid glare only served to light a servile insurrection upon its hellish work of desolation and of death. When that hour shall come, and come it will if the doctrines of the men of the Seward, Greeley, Chase, and Turnbull school are pushed to their inevitable consequences and conclusions, the tie that now binds this Union and grapples State to State with hooks of steel, shall become a rope of sand, which the breath of faction may scatter to the winds.

Deem you this exaggeration! If it be so, then it is not the fault of that Republican party in the North, who from time to time sent armed men forward to that irrepressible conflict on the soil of Kansas, putting in the lands of peaceful emigrants Sharp's rifles, and throwing down the gauntlet of defiance to our Southern brethren, and invoking the very strife that they desired to have kindled, and which first excited the brain of that mad old fanatic and enthusiast who, now bleeding and in chains, is awaiting that fate which, according to all the rules of justice, should be meted out to such men as Beecher, Chapin, Greeley, Blair, and a host of others who first hissed him on, and cowardly left him to do his work unaided and alone. The men who first sent emissaries into Kansas—who first whispered in their ears words of fierce excitement and unextinguished hate against our Southern brethren, are the men who, if they are not responsible to the legal tribunals of the country, are responsible before the Higher Laws, which they acknowledge as above such tribunals, for all the fierce mischief they have provoked. And that party, which under the name of Republican first gave its money, its time, its intellect, and its labor to be-

ginning and keeping up this irrepressible conflict on the soil of Kansas, cannot and shall not dodge the responsibility they have so wantonly assumed; and when haunted by the ghostly victims it has betrayed, no wonder its knees smite together and its ghastly eye-balls glare, as, like the startled conscience-stricken Macbeth, before the unmoved ghost of Banquo, it utters the same lie that he did—and exclaims,

“Thou canst not say I did it; never shake
Thy gory locks at me.”

My friends I know there are men, patriotic men, who have without thought thrown themselves into the Republican party, and whose hands are guiltless of all this blood, and upon whose conscience it never will rest. But there is an abolitionized element entering into and forming part of this Republican party, without which it could not live an hour. That is the element, that like a salamander rejoices in the fires of sectional strife? That is the element which has sown the dragon's teeth in Kansas, and brought forth strife and armed men. That is the element, which rearing on high its baneful crest, in the hour of triumph hissed forth that damnable heresy, that the irrepressible conflict between freedom and slavery must go on until this country was all free or all slave. It was the working of that element which filled the soul of the poor wretch, Brown, until brain and heart both reeled beneath the impulse, and drove him headlong on to be the first martyr in a strife which he had been taught to believe by Beecher, Greely and Chapin, was only

“Freedom's battle once begun.”

This abolitionized element preaches constant and endless agitation upon this slavery question. I know that it does not yet dare openly to proclaim that slavery shall be abolished where it exists, but simply confine itself, or pretends to do so, to preventing its further extension. But behind all this lies the hope of the future, not dimly forshadowed either in that

devilish expression about the "irrepressible conflict that is going on between freedom and slavery"—aye! openly avowed in that plain and startling declaration "that this country must be one day all slave or all free." If this be not the fell spirit of Abolition that speaks such swelling words, then it is some other spirit in its likeness.

Our Northern brethren may ponder over the eloquent remarks of their Northern friends, and resolve to cast all their influence against the aggressions of the Republican Fanatics, who would destroy the union of these States to gratify their own wickedness.

CHAPTER IX.

Speech of the Hon. L. Q. C. Lamar, of Mississippi, on the Excitement of the Times—His noble Defense of Slavery—Civil War in the United States predicted years ago by Commodore Decatur, of the United States Navy—Slavery proven to have existed in the Hebrew Nation—Lord Macaulay, the author, quoted to show the vast ruin it would entail upon thousands of the whites in England, were Slavery abolished in the United States—The great blessings of the Cotton Crop.

WE give entire the speech of the Hon. L. Q. C. LAMAR, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, February 21, 1860.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, and having under consideration the President's Annual Message, Mr. Lamar said:

“MR. CHAIRMAN: I obtained the floor several days ago, for the purpose of replying to some arguments advanced in a very ingenious and well-considered speech from the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. FERRY.] I desire to begin my remarks to-day by a quotation from the philosopher and poet, Coleridge, which I will thank the Clerk to read for me.”

The Clerk read as follows:

“An American commander, who had deserved and received the highest honors which his grateful country, through her assembled representatives, could bestow upon him, once said to

me, with a sigh, 'In an evil hour for my country did the French and Spaniards abandon Louisiana to the United States. We were not sufficiently a country before; and should we ever be mad enough to drive the English from Canada and her other North American Provinces, we shall soon cease to be a country at all. Without local attachment, without national honor, we shall resemble a swarm of insects that settle on the fruits of the earth to corrupt and consume them, rather than men who love and cleave to the land of their forefathers. After a shapeless anarchy, and a series of civil wars, we shall at last be formed into many countries, unless the vices engendered in the process should demand further punishment, and we should previously fall beneath the despotism of some military adventurer, like a lion, consumed by an inward disease, prostrate and helpless beneath the beak and talons of a vulture, or yet meaner bird of prey.' "

The distinguished commander there referred to, Mr. Chairman, was Decatur. No one can read that declaration without feeling some disposition to inquire whether we are about to realize its fulfillment. The animosities that exist between the two sections of the Confederacy, the discord that reigned for seven long weeks on this floor, are fearful tokens of a deep-seated disorder in our political system.

My object to-day is to inquire how far my constituents and the people with whom they are associated are responsible for the existing condition of things. Mississippi, sir, has grown up under this Federal Union. There is not, within her limits, a proprietor who does not hold his home under a grant from the Federal Government. Her noble university, and her common schools, are all established by donations from the public domain, which she has received, in common with all the new States. It is true, that in the special and appreciable advantages of Federal legislation—such as discriminations in favor of industrial pursuits, and commercial enterprise, and the re

turns of taxation, in the form of Government expenditures—she receives far less than an average share. She has no ships to participate in the monopoly granted to American vessels of the coasting trade, and the benefit of tonnage duties in their favor in the foreign trade. Her population have no fishing or other bounties from the National Treasury; and the tariff on imports does not operate to protect the productions of her industry. She has no army of contractors or Federal officers; nor are there any public buildings of imperial magnificence constructed by the Government within her limits. But she is prosperous; and the heart of her people beats truer to the Union than to their own tranquillity. Nor will she be driven from her devotion, except by causes which she has not created, and by consequences for which she is not responsible. Mississippi has never declared herself in favor of disunion, *per se*. She will not make that declaration until she becomes convinced that her sister States north are deliberately determined to endanger her internal and social institutions, or to impair her dignity and equality as a confederate State.

Now, sir, I should not be candid if I did not say that there are many, perhaps a majority, in my State who do not speak with the same reserve and caution as I am doing on this occasion. The obvious and unmistakable tokens of design in the long-continued and crafty agitation of this slavery question, have produced alienation and distrust. It is a unanimous sentiment in the South that the existence of this Republican organization is a standing menace to her peace and security, and a standing insult to her character. More especially have the recent events in Virginia, the discordant proceedings of this House, and the angry discussion on the Helper book, created a tone and tendency in the public feeling which must tell unhappily on the political transactions of our country for a long series of years.

I was pained, during that discussion, to hear the distin-

guished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CORWIN] ask, in a tone of levity which evinced how lightly he esteemed the temper of our people, "Why, gentlemen, can a small book like the *Helper Compend* endanger your proud institutions?" Sir, a million such books could not, for an instant, affect the South, but for the conviction that it represents and embodies the sentiments of a large mass of the Northern people. You, gentlemen, who have disclaimed and repudiated its *practical recommendations*, do not deny, I believe you all admit, that the *fundamental doctrine* of the book—that slavery is a great moral, social, and political wrong, to be opposed by the Government everywhere and under all circumstances, by all constitutional means, its extension to be prohibited, and the powers of this Government to be applied to confine it with a view to its extinction—is the predominant opinion of a large mass of the Northern people; that it infects their literature, pervades their jurisprudence, is inculcated in their theology, controls their local legislation, and constitutes, this day, the sole creed of a political party which commands a majority of States, and overwhelming majorities in States at the North.

Now, sir, this is a portentous fact; for a moral sentiment thus diffused among the majority of a great people will work itself out into practical action, and the law—fundamental or statute—which obstructs its progress to development must yield before it or be overborne by it.

Sir, institutions and constitutions and laws and governments are at last but external structures, whose roots are in the moral and intellectual life of the people for whom they exist; and any revolution in that moral and mental life must have its corresponding effect upon institutions subject to its influence.

Now, sir, among a great, earnest, and religious people, whose moral and religious conviction is that slavery is "a sin against God and a crime against humanity," in the language of the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. FERRY,] I ask what

countenance or support will be given to a Constitution which sanctions that sin, or to institutions which uphold and establish that crime? Let, sir, the party which represents this sentiment get possession of this Government, intrench itself in all its departments, arm itself with its power, and I ask if the barriers of the Constitution, the forms of law, the obligations of humanity, and the sovereignty of the States will not all melt down in its fiery path? Is it strange, sir, that our people should think of withdrawing their imperiled institutions from the sweep of this fanatical revolution? And yet, sir, if a Southern gentleman, from a heart oppressed with gloomy forebodings for his country, expresses any such sentiment upon this floor, forthwith these Republican gentlemen—ay, sir, and grave Senators—seize upon it, tear it from its context, misrepresent the spirit which prompted its utterance, and send it forth grouped with other expressions similarly garbled, to arouse passion, inflame prejudice, and madden fanaticism.

Sir, the calamity of the times is, that the people of the North do not understand the people of the South; and it is to the interest of a certain class of politicians to perpetuate the misunderstanding.

The gentleman from Connecticut, sir, in his speech a few days since, repeated the assertion of the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. CORWIN,] that it was the policy of the founders of our Republic to prevent the establishment of slavery in new communities. In my opinion, a greater error was never committed upon this floor. My own State is a standing refutation of the proposition. Sir, slavery exists this day in Mississippi by the encouragement—certainly with the consent—of this Federal Government when it was in the hands of the founders of our Republic. By the act of 1798, the President was authorized to extend over the Mississippi Territory, the same Government which existed northwest of the Ohio, excepting the last clause of the famous ordinance prohibiting slavery;

and that was repealed. And upon the motion of Mr. Thatcher, of Massachusetts, to protect what he called "the rights of man," the Wilmot-proviso principle was proposed to be extended over Mississippi, and received at first but twelve votes, and upon the last proposition but one vote. Now, sir, this seems to me to be a legislative declaration to exclude the conclusion that there was any desire upon the part of the founders of our Republic to prevent the establishment of slavery in new communities. It certainly displays the considerate caution which then existed on this subject. It shows that there was no disposition on the part of the founders of our Republic to interfere with the delicate relation in new Territories; and it would have been a policy of peace had this precedent been followed in all subsequent legislation. This act shows that the United States gave their free and spontaneous consent that slaves might be carried and held in Mississippi as property, and that her freemen were, at the proper time, to form an independent government, and become a member of the Union on equal terms with the other parties to the compact. Now, sir, Mississippi stands here to-day, and finds slavery, through the action of this Federal Government, an integral and live element in her social system, interfused with the social relations, the industrial pursuits, the investments of capital, and the political forms of her people.

Gentlemen, I ask, have you the right—I do not mean the constitutional power—have you the moral right, is it just, is it tolerant, to reverse the action of this Government and embark it in a career of hostility to an institution which the action of this Government has made the basis upon whose durability our social and political order is constituted? The condition of Mississippi is that of other new States in the South and South west.

The gentleman from Connecticut justifies this policy of his party, on the ground that our institution is regarded by the

people of the North as "hateful to God and unjust to man;" that "it cannot exist of natural right." But when he seeks to give the authority upon which he bases this dogma, he takes particular pains to lodge it in that most secret place in all nature, "the instincts of the human heart" and the dictates of natural reason.

MR. FERRY.—An enlightened conscience.

MR. LAMAR.—Yes, sir; the dictates of an enlightened conscience. Sir, he almost repeated the proposition of the gentleman from Ohio, [MR. BINGHAM,] in a debate during the last Congress, when he said: "I appeal to your immortal spirit, can you be rightfully reduced to slavery?" The gentleman from Connecticut, following that line of argument, asks: "Is there a man upon this floor who would not rather die than be a bondman? who would not rather see his little son dead in his coffin than see that son sold into slavery?"

Well, sir, I answer the gentleman, (and I presume it is just as he wishes me to answer,) that I cannot be rightfully reduced to slavery; nor can you, sir; nor can the gentleman himself. But, sir, does it follow that men are right-angled triangles—that whatever is true of one is predicable of all men? Will these gentlemen say that that is the test by which the rightfulness of a civil regulation is to be determined? If so, I will ask these gentlemen a question: "I appeal to your immortal spirit," can you rightfully be reduced to a felon's cell? I ask the gentleman, "Is there a man upon this floor who would not rather die than be" a felon? who "would not rather see his little son dead in his coffin" than to see that son torn from his mother's embrace, and doomed to imprisonment for life with hard labor, the associate of convicts and criminals?

MR. FERRY.—Does the gentleman wish an answer?

MR. LAMAR.—Not just now. Sir, they can give me but one answer, and that is the answer which I give to their question. And yet there are hundreds of thousands of our fellow-citizens,

in whom the same immortal spirit resides, who are reduced to that ignominious condition; and these gentlemen justify the ordinances and statutes which condemn them to it; not because they are not "created with equal, inherent, natural, and inalienable rights," but simply because the order and well-being of society require that they shall be deprived of that liberty and equality which, in our hands, is such a priceless, peerless blessing. But I again "appeal to the gentleman's immortal spirit." I ask him, can he be made subservient and obedient to another's will—his intellectual and moral nature subject to the restraint and control of another's authority? Sir, these gentlemen are ready to fight for the liberty of private judgment. And yet all the young men of the country, under twenty-one years of age, are reduced to that condition, not because their rights are not natural, inherent, and inalienable, but simply because the interests of society require that they should be kept under this personal restraint until they are fitted for political and social equality.

But, sir, I appeal again "to the gentleman's immortal spirit," and I ask him, can he rightfully be deprived of all political power, even the right of voting; every civil privilege, even of suing, in a Government which acts upon every relation of his being, which taxes his person and taxes his property, and affects, for weal or woe, the destinies of his posterity? The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BINGHAM] has already justified rebellion in Kansas "to maintain the natural right of self-government;" and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FERRY] has asserted that one of the objects of our Revolution was to establish "universal equality in political rights." Yet, sir, one half of our adult population—the better half, who have the same immortal nature, and a far purer nature than ours—are reduced to that condition; are deprived of every political right, of every civil privilege. Their existence is ignored by the laws of some States, and their very persons, in many in-

stances, are subject to the custody of coarser and inferior natures. And these gentlemen justify all this, not upon the ground that woman's nature is not immortal, or that her rights are less inherent and inalienable, but simply because the necessities of society demand her consecration to those high and noble responsibilities which unfit her for the exercise of political rights.

Now, I put the question, and I want it answered, whether female dependence or the immaturity of youth constitute any better reason for the privation of political and social equality, for the infliction of civil disabilities and personal restraints, than the ignorance, superstition, the mental and moral debasement which centuries of barbarism have entailed upon a servile race? I want to know, sir, if the good of society, its interests and order, as a whole, does not require that this race should be retained in its existing relation; whether the institution does not stand vindicated by every principle upon which human institutions repose?

Mr. Chairman, the mistake of these gentlemen is this: that men are to be governed by certain fixed, inflexible, invariable rules, deduced from natural reason; and that a government which is applicable to a race of intelligent white men can be forced upon States consisting of two distinct races, opposite in color, and differing as widely in character, disposition, moral and mental habits, as are the opposing characteristics of barbarism and civilization.

But, sir, shall we always be disputing about these "natural rights of man" and the foundations of society? Are we to have no time-honored institutions, no recognized precedents, no grand maxims of common law, growing up around our Constitution, and almost as sacred as the Constitution itself? Is our grand Republic, its destiny, its administration, its policy, to be forever floating hither and thither upon the uncertain billows of this beautiful but dangerous sea of political

metaphysics? Are these gentlemen prepared to say that every institution of society must stand or fall, according as it conforms, or fails to conform, to some principle of natural right, deduced by each generation from natural reason? Where, sir, would such a principle stop? There are philosophers, and I believe they are correct, who say that the right of individual property cannot be deduced from the natural reason of man.

But, sir, this principle is not limited in its action to political forms; it institutes revolt in all the elements of the social system, and raises impious war against the recognized ordinances and express commandments of God. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FERRY] stated, the other day, that there was no warrant in the language of inspiration for the relation of master and slave as it exists in the South. Now, sir, I am not going to quote the Bible upon these gentlemen; but I propose to give them the language of a learned Northern divine, the president of a northern college, an advocate of immediate abolition, whose book on moral science is the text-book of your northern colleges, academies, and schools. Dr. Wayland, in his letters on the subject of slavery, speaking of the 25th chapter of Leviticus, in which the Hebrews are commanded to buy the children of the strangers among them, uses the following language:

“The authority to take them as *slaves* seems to be a part of this original, peculiar, and anomalous grant.”

I presume, Mr. Chairman, none but an Abolitionist would characterize a grant of God as *anomalous*.

Again:

“I grant at once that the Hebrews held *slaves* from the time of the conquest of Canaan, and that Abraham and the patriarchs held them many centuries before. I grant, also, Moses enacted laws with special reference to that relation.”

I hope I have the attention of the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. FERRY] to the next sentence:

"I wonder," says Dr. Wayland, "*that any should have the hardihood to deny so plain a matter of record. I should as soon deny the delivery of the ten commandments to Moses.*"

Mr. FERRY.—Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. LAMAR.—It is this stupid hour rule that prevents my yielding to the gentleman.

Mr. FERRY.—I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman further than to say, that I will take another opportunity to answer him.

Mr. LAMAR.—Sir, the gentleman said that the sentiment of all Christendom was repugnant to the institution of slavery. Christianity came into the world when the relation of master and slave was one of cruelty and hostility. "Our slaves are our enemies," was the observation of the elder Cato. How did our Saviour and his apostles treat that relation? I propose, sir, no views of my own; but I will give an extract from Dr. Wayland's *Elements of Moral Science*, the text-book of your northern schools. In an argument, seeking to prove "the moral principles of the Gospel to be directly subversive of the principles of slavery," he makes the following admission:

"The Gospel neither commands masters to manumit their slaves nor authorizes slaves to free themselves from their masters; and, also, it goes further, and prescribes the duties suited to both parties in their present condition."

Again:

"The *duty of slaves* is also explicitly made known in the Bible. They are bound to obedience, fidelity, submission, and respect to their masters, not only to the good and kind, but also to the unkind and froward; not, however, on the ground of *duty to man*, but on the ground of *duty to God*."—*Wayland's Elements of Moral Science*, pages 225 and 229, edition in the Congressional Library.

This is abolition authority, I want it understood.

Now, sir, the teachings of the Apostles, as they are here made known by Dr. Wayland, were the teachings of the Christian Church. The Church was itself a slaveholder, and Christian kings and princes followed its example. There is in Hampton Court at this day, the marble bust of the favorite negro slave of William III., Prince of Orange—one of the cherubim of English liberty—with a carved collar around his neck, with a padlock upon it, and in every respect made like a dog's collar.

But, sir, there is one authority which I came near forgetting to read, and which I suppose stands higher with those gentlemen than even Dr. Wayland. It is a work which is an elaborate exposition of certain abstract principles of New England theology and politics, albeit in a narrative and dramatic form. I read from the "Minister's Wooing," by Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe. In this novel, which would stand unequalled as a work of fiction but for the anti-slavery bigotry which runs like a coarse black thread through the otherwise admirable tissue of thought and feeling, she puts in the mouth of the erudite and learned Dr. Hopkins—the hero, by the way, of the tale—the following answer to Mr. Marvyn's question :

"Was there not an express permission given to Israel to buy and hold slaves as of old?"

Says the Doctor :

"Doubtless; but many permissions were given to them which were local and temporary; for if we hold them to apply to the human race, the Turks might quote the Bible for making slaves of us, if they could; and the Algerines have the Scriptures all on their side; and our own blacks at some future time, if they can get the power, might justify themselves in making slaves of us." [Page 174.]

Now, sir, I do not wish the point of my argument misunderstood. I am not seeking to show a Bible sanction of Southern slavery as it now exists. I do not ask your assent to that. My

point is, that the *principle* with which you are warring upon us, is condemned by the ordinance of God and the language of Scripture. I say that God would never, even "for local and temporary purposes," have given permission for that which comes in conflict with those immutable principles of natural right of which he is the author. When he established slavery among the Jews, he established the principle that there may be conditions and circumstances under which slavery is not "hateful to God or unjust to man." Nor does this argument justify Turkish slavery, Algerine slavery, or white slavery; it justifies no sort of slavery except that which justifies itself by the rightfulness of its own conditions and circumstances. And this is the ground upon which we of the South place our cherished institutions. We maintain that these justifying circumstances do exist in relation to our institution of negro slavery. They consist in the unfitness of the black race for a condition higher than that of slavery. Our proposition is, that when these two races are brought into contact, the supremacy of the white man must be acknowledged, and his right to govern both races with reference to the happiness of both. This is the principle upon which, until recently, the legislation of all your Northern States was founded. They all asserted the supremacy of the white man, and the subordination of the black man.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FERRY] stated that the object of our Revolution was to establish "universal equality in political rights, and the indefeasible title of *all men* to social and civil liberty." He ought to have had the candor to have held up his own State to public reprehension for violating this principle; for, in Connecticut, he knows the negro has neither political nor social equality; that he is deprived of the right of voting; that he is legally incompetent as a witness against white men, and excluded from the right of intermarriage with whites. Those gentlemen guard sedulously enough against all contact of this race with themselves or their

own class of society. I could not insult that gentleman more grossly than to ask him if he is willing to throw open the sacred precincts of his family and allow the negro to come in as an equal member. No, sir; but he is for *freeing his labor*, and, possibly, for giving him the right of voting, and by that means bringing him in contact and equality, *not with himself*, but with *the laboring white freemen of the North*; and why such a proposition does not kindle a consuming flame of indignation among those laboring freemen of the North, is one of those political phenomena for which I will not undertake to account.

Sir, the only cause of the difference between the legislation of Northern and Southern States upon the subject of slavery is, that the negroes are not sufficient in numbers at the North to make it necessary to reduce them to the condition of domestic servitude, while with us that condition is indispensable to the good order and welfare of the whole society. And it is demonstrable—and I will make it so appear, if I have time—that the negro in the Southern States has reached a moral and intellectual development superior to his race in any other position in which he has been placed. That he contributes more, in his present condition, to the good of mankind, their moral and intellectual progress, than in any other position in which he has been placed. What was his condition when he was first brought here? Look at him upon his native continent. The most humane explorers of the African continent tell us that they exist there without social or political order, without modesty or shame,—some of the tribes not even reaching the civilization of the fig-leaf.

I propose, just here, to read from Hegel's Philosophy of History, an imperishable monument of human genius, in which the author holds "freedom to be the essence of humanity, and slavery the condition of injustice." And what does he say?

"The negro, as already observed, exhibits the natural man

in his completely wild and untamed state. We must lay aside all thought of reverence and morality, all that we call feeling, if we would rightly comprehend him. There is nothing harmonious with humanity to be found in this type of character." [Page 97.]

"The undervaluing of humanity among them reaches an incredible degree of intensity. Tyranny is regarded as no wrong, and cannibalism is looked upon as quite customary and proper." * * * * "The devouring of human flesh is altogether consonant with the general principles of the African race. To the sensual negro, human flesh is but an object of sense—mere flesh." [Pages 99–100.]

After describing many other characteristics, the author concludes "*slavery to have been the occasion of the increase of human feeling among the negroes. The doctrine which we deduce from this condition of slavery among the negroes, and which constitutes the only side of the question that has an interest for our inquiry, is, that which we deduce from the idea, viz. : that the 'natural condition' itself is one of absolute and thorough injustice, contravention of the right and just. Every intermediate grade between this and the realization of a rational state retains, as might be expected, elements and aspects of injustice. Therefore, we find slavery even in the Greek and Roman States, as we do serfdom, down to the latest times. But thus existing in a State, slavery is itself a phase of advance from the merely isolated sensual existence, a phase of education, a mode of becoming participant in a higher morality, and the culture connected with it.*" [Page 104.]

Now, sir, who will say that the three hundred thousand negroes, whose character is thus described by this German author, brought over to this continent, would ever have had their condition improved, or would ever have secured to themselves the benefits they now enjoy, had they been left in their "natural condition?" At that time there were two barbarous races

which came in contact, upon this continent, with the European. The one was the African, occupying the lowest point in the scale of human existence; the other was the noble Indian race, superior to the African in intelligence, in moral and physical development. Free as the wild bird of his native forests, bold as the stream which dashed down his mountain gorges, generous as the bounteous nature around him, the American Indian goes into history the poetic embodiment of savage life. What has been his fate, compared with that of the African?

What has become of the Narragansetts, Pequots, Senecas, Onondagas, and Delawares? Driven back by the advancing wave of European civilization to continually contracting circles, with diminished means of subsistence, into degradation, wretchedness, and extinction.

The African, with all its foulness, with all its prosaic vulgarities, domesticated and disciplined, has been by that same wave borne up higher and higher, until now it furnishes inspiration for Northern song, heroes and heroines for Northern romances, and is invited by Northern statesmen into their charmed circle of political and social equality. Not just yet, gentlemen, if you please. He is not your equal; and history proves that even when he has reached this point of civilization, if you take from under him the institution which has borne him up to it, he relapses into his pristine barbarism. I intended to show this by detailed references to the French islands, the English Antilles, and other countries in which slavery has been abolished. I could have shown that in Hayti, where the negro was left with all the endowments of a civilization which vied with that of Rome, in gorgeous magnificence, you see now nothing but poverty, vice, indolence, and all the other signs of a rapidly approaching barbarism. I intended to show from anti-slavery authority that the British Antilles have disappointed every promise and frustrated every hope that accompanied the act of emancipation. I intended to show the condition of the free

colored population in Peru, as exhibited by a most intelligent German traveler, Von Tschudi, whose work was published among the "Choice Reading" of the anti-slavery publishing house of Wiley & Putnam, in New York.

I need not refer to Liberia. The gentleman formerly from Missouri [Mr. BLAIR], has demonstrated on this floor that Liberia is a failure, and Africa still the "house of bondage." The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CORWIN] has expressed some doubt about that matter, but he can certainly point to no sign of an advance beyond the original moral status of the colony; and, sir, if it does not show signs of decay and dissolution, it is because the emigration of our freed negroes pours constantly into the shrunken veins of its sickly civilization fresh tides of moral and mental life. I need not refer to the condition of the free negro in the Northern States. These gentlemen are familiar with it. One thing I will say, that the Census returns show that his moral and physical condition is superior in the South to what it is in the North. And if freedom to the individual be such a boon and blessing to the African, Southern slavery has done more in this respect for the race than Northern abolitionism. There have been one hundred thousand more emancipated by the Southern States than have been emancipated by the Northern States: and there are forty thousand free negroes living in the South, now, more than are resident in the Northern States.

If, then, we show that the condition of the negro at the South is superior to his condition in any other country, and that the abolition of slavery has always been followed by immediate retrogression, I ask of what has humanity to complain against the institution?

Sir, another argument that has been advanced by Northern gentlemen, and by the leader of their party is, that the interests of the white race require the exclusion of this institution from new territory; that it should be dedicated to free soil,

and to the freemen of the North. Now, I want to say, in passing, that that puts out of view every consideration of humanity which these gentlemen have made the instrument of the fanaticism that has hitherto been waged against us. But I will pass on. How do the interests of the white race require the restriction of slavery? They say that free labor is dishonored by its contact with slave labor. How? The two systems co-exist under our Republic. Look at labor as it exists at the North—the mighty North—the seat of commerce, manufactures, mechanic arts, accumulated wealth, and common schools. Look at the mighty population that fills that vast territory with the hum of its free industry. The toiling millions that constitute the substratum on which this splendid fabric of free society rears its aspiring head! Are they not all freemen? Is not each one of them the equal of the proudest and richest in the land,—tenacious of his rights and proud of his position? What, though he is often compelled to toil in mid-day, while the very earth is melting with fervent heat, and while the negro slave is resting from his work, still his labor is dignified and honorable, because it is free; and although commerce may languish, and manufactures go into decay, and the wages of labor fall, and the price of provisions increase, yet he can hush the mutterings of discontent and still the gnawings of hunger by the one proud, glorious thought—*the dignity of labor*. Now, how is this labor contaminated by the existence of Southern slave labor? Sir, our negroes are working *under* and *for* your free laborers at the North. They furnish them with the raw material on which this free labor exercises its skill and industry,—the raw material which is the very basis of your commerce and manufacturing enterprise.

But you say it becomes dishonored by coming in contact with slave labor in the common territory. This very contact exists in the South: and is labor dishonored there? Why, according to the estimate of these gentlemen, there are only

three hundred and twenty thousand slaveholders in the South : all the balance are non-slaveholding laborers. Mark that ! Now, gentlemen, universal suffrage exists in the South. Each one of these three hundred and twenty thousand slaveholders has one vote, and no more. Each one of the five million non-slaveholders has one vote, and no less. These latter, then, have the overwhelming majority. Sir, the institution is in the hollow of the hand of the non-slaveholder of the South. He has but to close his hand, and the institution is crushed. He sees its effects on the slave ; he feels its effects on himself. Sir, if these effects were degrading, why not throw it off, when he could do it by simply depositing a ballot in a senseless urn ? I will tell you why he does not do it. I will show you why it is that, from that vast body of independent, voting freemen, there comes up not one whisper of disapprobation, not one murmur of discontent, not one protest against its morality, its justice, and its expediency. It is because there is no class among whom negro slavery secures such wide-spread blessings as the non-slaveholders of the South. There has never been a race of men more maligned and lied about than that very class of freemen in the South. I know them. I have lived among them, and have felt the heart-warm grasp of their strong hands ; and I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that God's sun does not shine on a nobler, prouder, happier, more prosperous, and elevated class of people, than the non-slaveholders of the South. It is impossible, from the very nature and constitution of Southern society, that it should be otherwise.

I have time to mention only one fact, among others, that shows you its advantages in their view. Mr. Webster, in one of his speeches, spoke of the ownership of land as constituting the basis of free government, and said that suffrage should be restricted to those whose property gave them an interest in the preservation of the State. Now, I do not think that. I think that an honest, intelligent laboring man is as much entitled to

a participation in the Government as the member of any other class of society.

But there are certain moral advantages in favor of a land-owning community. Sir, in every country, and in every age, the proprietorship of the soil has been regarded as a position of dignity and of personal elevation. Now, sir, that is the position of the non-slaveholding laborers of the South. They are a nation of landowners. There is not such a body of landowners in the world as the non-slaveholders of the South. Each of them feels in himself a pride of character, an elevation of position; and, sir, he feels that he is not merely a freeman, he is a freeholder: more than that, he is a *gentleman*. You talk about free labor at the North and free soil, as if it did not exist in greater purity in the South than anywhere else. What you call "operatives" have to share the profits of their labor with capital, and it is hinted that capital gets the lion's share. What we call "slaves" are owned by capital, and get their return only in food, raiment, shelter, and protecting care. But, sir, true free labor is that which the Southern farmer, with his own free arm, applies to his own soil, allowing neither master, capitalist, nor employer, to have any participation in its profits. And, sir, what are those profits? Not alone the crop of cotton, corn, and potatoes: something more than that. When the strong, brave man drives his plowshare through the fallow ground, the up-turned sod reveals to his eye that which is richer to him than the golden sands of California:

"'Tis the sparkle of liberty"

and personal independence. Sir, at the end of the year he has other gains, too, that his labor brings him: the industry and honesty of the father, the household virtues of the mother, the intelligence of the sons, the chastity of the daughters,—there, sir, is a harvest which we would not barter for this wide world's commerce, and all its honors besides.

But, sir, let us see what this institution has done for the progress of mankind ; and this brings me to the third class of men in the South who have been subject to misrepresentation. I allude to the Southern planters. I have but a moment to spare, and I will allude to one branch of Southern industry as an illustration of the whole,—I mean cotton culture. Some idea of the importance of the cotton trade to the civilized world may be obtained by the following graphic description of its influence upon Great Britain, from the pen of Macaulay ;

“I see in this country a great manufacturing population drawing the materials of manufacture from a limited market. I see a great cotton trade carried on, which furnishes nearly two million people with food, clothes, and firing ; and I say that, if you shut out slave-grown cotton, you would produce a mass of misery among the people whom Providence has committed to your charge, frightful to contemplate ; you would introduce desolation into your richly-flourishing manufacturing districts ; you would reduce hundreds on hundreds to beggary and destitution ; you would risk the stability of your institutions ; and when you had done all this, you would have great reason to doubt whether you had conferred any great benefits on the particular class for whom you made such a sacrifice.”

Now, sir, the cotton plant grows in the East Indies. It has been long a product of Bengal and Malabar. It grows in the West Indies. During the French domination, Hayti exported a larger quantity of cotton than the North American continent. It exists in Persia ; it exists in Brazil ; it exists in Egypt and China ; in Spain, in Malta, and in Mexico ; it exists in Africa itself. The peculiarity of climate and soil necessary to its production has been greatly exaggerated, in my opinion. I attribute the vast production, swelled from one hundred and fifty thousand pounds to four million bales in seventy years, to the combination of moral and physical qualities which have been associated in its culture.

The Southern planter is not the indolent, aristocratic nabob which he has been represented to be. He is, in general, careful, patient, provident, industrious, forbearing, and yet firm and determined. It is these qualities which have enabled him to take a race of untamed savages, with no habits except such as inspire disgust, with no arts, no information, and out of such a people to make the finest body of fixed laborers that the world has ever seen. Sir, England has imported Coolies, Chinese, natives from the African coast, into her colonies, and yet she has been unable to compete with the Southern plantations. There is no product which requires such a constant and unremitting attention, such continuous labor, as the cotton plant. The great complaint in the British colonies is, that the fruit of each year's effort is lost by the broken and irregular labor of the operatives. Now, sir, the Southern planter has secured continuity, consistency, and steadfastness in the most indolent, inconsistent, and capricious of the human race. Burke, in his speech upon conciliation with America, paid to the victorious industry employed in the fisheries of the colonies of New England a just and glowing tribute of admiration. The perseverance, the dexterous and firm sagacity enlisted in that perilous mode of industry, is worthy of his esteem. Something of the same qualities are displayed by the Southern planter in the production of those beneficent results which have flowed from the culture of the great tropical products of the Southern States.

The Southern planter penetrates the dense forests, the tangled brake, the gloomy wilderness of our river swamps, where pestilence has its abode, and there, day by day and year by year, amidst exposure, privation, and sickness, are his foresight, his prudence, his self-reliance, his adaptation of means to ends, called into requisition. In the communion with himself,—which his isolation makes indispensable,—and in the daily and yearly provision for a large body of domestics and depend-

ents for whom he has to think, and whose labor he has to direct, he forms those qualities which enable him to emerge from his isolation to fill the county court, or to become a member of his State Legislature; to discharge the duties of local magistracy, or to take his place in the National councils.

The solution of the enigma of the "slave power," so mysterious to transcendental and infant-school philosophers, may be sought here. Its basis lies in that cool, vigorous judgment and unerring sense applicable to the ordinary affairs and intercourse of men which the Southern mode of life fosters. The habits of industry, firmness of purpose, fidelity to dependents, self-reliance, and the sentiment of justice in all the various relations of life which are necessary to the management of a well-ordered plantation, fit men to guide legislatures and command armies.

I see gentlemen are disposed to smile at this suggestion. In confirmation of what I say, I have only to point them to the fact that it was in such communities as these that a Washington, a Jackson, a Taylor, a Scott, a Twiggs, a Quitman, a Davis, a Lee, a Ringgold, a Bragg, a Butler, and a host of others, acquired those qualities which enabled them, in the positions in which their country placed them, to add such undying lustre to the American name. It was in such communities that such men as Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Polk, Lowndes, Calhoun, Clay, Macon, Marshall, Taney, and a host of others that I could mention, acquired those characteristics which their countrymen North and South instinctively discerned whenever "called upon to face some awful moment to which Heaven has joined great issues, good or bad, for human kind."

I have sought, sir, in a cursory way, under the whip and spur of this hour rule, to show that there is nothing in our institutions which cannot stand justified before impartial history for our mode of dealing with the race which Providence has

placed in our hands. I do not pretend to say that, in the adjustment of our economic forces, there may not be ameliorations. I do not pretend to say that we have arrived at a standard of ideal perfection. But I do say that there is a reach of thought and a maturity of judgment brought to bear upon this subject in the South which is always adequate to evolve the greatest good. We certainly can learn nothing from the enemies of our institutions and conspirators against our peace.

I come to the last consideration I think it proper to urge upon the attention of the House. Is it the part of statesmen to attempt to exercise the powers of this Government in a spirit unfriendly to the institutions and interests involved in the political and economical system which I have been discussing? The father of the Constitution, Mr. Madison, on the floor of the Convention which framed it, expressed a different sentiment:

“He admitted that every peculiar interest, whether in any class of citizens or any description of States, ought to be secured as far as possible. WHEREVER THERE IS DANGER OF ATTACK, THERE OUGHT TO BE GIVEN A CONSTITUTIONAL POWER OF DEFENSE. But he contended the States were divided into different interests, not by their difference in size, but by other circumstances, the most material of which resulted partly from climate, but principally from the effects of their having, or not having, slaves. These two causes concurred in forming the great division of interests in the United States. It did not lay between the large and small States. It lay between the Northern and Southern States; and, if any defensive power were necessary, *it ought to be mutually to these two interests.* He was so strongly impressed with this important truth, he had been casting about in his mind for some scheme that would answer the purpose.”

I do not anticipate that the magnanimous counsels of a wise

and patriotic statesman, whose provisions embraced in their scope the entire Republic, will obtain such authority as to secure additional guarantees to our institutions. These we have not asked. We ask only our constitutional rights in the Union. The Southern people demand that this organized "irrepressible conflict" shall stop—that the institution of slavery shall be maintained as an existing fact in this Confederacy. The sentiment is rapidly approaching to unanimity among them, that any attempt to impair its property-value, or a single political privilege which it confers, or any of the constitutional rights by which it is guarantied, or to place over them the party which arrogates to itself the right to do any of these things, will be a fatal blow at the peace and stability of this great country.

CHAPTER X.

Helper's Quotations from the Bible annihilated—Slavery not denounced by the Bible—The Proofs of Slavery as it existed before Christ—Southern Slavery Beneficial both to the Slave and his Master—The Bible endorses Slavery: hence the cry of the Republicans, "We must have an Anti-slavery Bible, an Anti-slavery Constitution, and an Anti-slavery God!"

MR. HELPER quotes the Bible as condemning slavery. Man will, when his mind becomes prejudiced, pervert the Holy Scriptures to evil,—his ideas thus giving it a meaning that was never intended by the inspired writers, viz.: a contradiction of itself. Now, we will say, that there is no condemnation set forth in the Bible in regard to slavery. In illustration of this statement, let the reader take such as these:—"Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful; proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful." Rom. i. 29-31. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witch-

craft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." Gal. v. 19-21. See, also, Matt. xv. 19; Mark vii. 21, 22; 1 Cor. v. 11, vi. 9, 10; Eph. v. 5; Col. iii. 8, 9; 1 Tim. i. 9, 10; 2 Tim. iii. 2-4; Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15.

By turning to the xxv. chap. Leviticus, 44th to 46th verses, inclusive, you will find the following words in support of slavery:—"Both *thy bond-men* and *thy bond-maids*, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy *bond-men* and *bond-maids*. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye *buy*, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land; and they shall be *your possession*," (i. e., your property.) "And ye shall take them as *an inheritance for your children after you*, to inherit them for a possession, *they shall be your bond-men forever*."

"And the sons of Noah, that went forth of the ark, were Shem, and Ham, and Japheth; and Ham is the father of Canaan: these are the three sons of Noah; and of them was the whole earth overspread."

Noah attained the age of nine hundred and fifty years; this period is divided thus: six hundred before the Deluge, and three hundred and fifty years after that event. This makes the age of Noah the second highest on record, that of Methuselah being the first, he having lived nine hundred and sixty-nine years. Noah died *Anno Mundi*, 2006,

as is generally agreed. Previous to his decease, he divided the earth among his three sons. Asia was assigned to Shem, Europe to Japheth, and Africa to Ham.

In the examination of the Holy Scriptures closely, we will find the prophecy concerning slavery.—“And Noah began to be a husbandman, and he planted a vineyard: and he drank of the wine, and was drunken; and he was uncovered within his tent. And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his brethren without. And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid it upon their shoulders, and went backward, and covered their father's nakedness. And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him. And he said, *Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.*” Here we have the establishment of slavery: its practical developments will appear as we progress.

Now we intend to show that the old *Patriarchs* were slaveholders:—

“Abimelech, King of Gerar, sent and took Sarah. But God came to Abimelech, in a dream by night, and said to him, Behold, thou art but a dead man, for the woman which thou hast taken, for she is a man's wife.” “And Abimelech took sheep, and oxen, and men-servants, and gave them unto Abraham, and restored him Sarah his wife.” Here we see, that Abraham had not only the number of his slaves increased, but that slavery existed in Palestine at this time. We think it will be evident, by reading the

other passages in connection with what we have quoted above.

Isaac was a slaveholder,—“For he had possession of flocks, and possession of herds, and great store of servants, and the Philistines envied him.”

Jacob was a slaveholder.—When Jacob left Messopotamia, and was returning to the Promised Land, expecting to meet Esau, whom he greatly feared, he sent messengers to him, “And commanded them, saying, Thus shall ye speak unto my Lord Esau : Thy servant Jacob saith thus : I have sojourned with Laban, and stayed there until now ; and I have oxen, and asses, flocks, and *men-servants*, and *women-servants* ; and I have sent to tell my lord, that I may find grace in thy sight.”

Having shown that slavery existed before the Advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, we will now proceed to show that the condition of slaves in Judea, in our Lord's day, was no better than it now is in our Southern States, whilst in all other countries it was greatly worse.

In Judea. “Both the food and clothing of slaves were of the poorest description. All their earnings went to their masters. The maid-servants were employed in domestic concerns, though not unfrequently they were compelled to engage in those duties which, from their nature, were more befitting the other sex.”

“They commonly had the consent of their masters to marry ; or, rather, to connect themselves with a woman in that way which is denominated by a Latin law term *contu-*

bernium.* The children that proceeded from this sort of marriages, were the property, not of the parents, but of their owners."—Jahn's Archæology, pp. 180, 181.

In Rome. "For slaves the lash was the common punishment; but for certain crimes, they used to be branded on the forehead, and sometimes were forced to carry a piece of wood round their necks wherever they went. When slaves were beaten, they used to be suspended with a weight tied to their feet, that they might not move them. When punished capitally, they were commonly crucified. If a master of a family was slain in his own house, and the murderer not discovered, all his domestic slaves were liable to be put to death. There was a continual market for slaves at Rome. The seller was bound to promise for the soundness of his slaves, and not to conceal their faults. Hence they were commonly exposed to sale naked; and they carried a scroll hanging at their necks, on which their good and bad qualities were specified."—Adam's Rom. Ant. pp. 48, 51.

In Greece. The condition of slaves in Greece appears to have been much the same as at Rome.—Potter's Gr. Ant. 1, 10.

Evident reference to slavery on the part of the Apostle we have in 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 22. St. Paul, in reference to the custom of purchasing slaves, on whose

* "*Contubernium* was the matrimony of slaves, a permitted cohabitation; not partaking of lawful marriage, which they could not contract."—Cooper's Justinian, p. 420.

head a price was then fixed, just as upon any other commodity, and who, when bought, were the property of the purchaser; by a very beautiful and expressive similitude, represents Christians as the servants (*doulos*) of Christ. And in Gal. vi. 17, alluding to the signatures with which slaves in those days were branded, writes:—"From henceforth let no man trouble me, for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus."—Horne's Introduction.

With the apostle, the word servant (*doulos*) is a favorite word for setting forth the relation which they sustained to Christ, as persons entirely and for life devoted to his service, and bound to implicit obedience. (See Rom. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Jude 1.)

But the most significant allusion to slavery—significant in so far as the point now under examination is concerned—is that contained in 1 Tim. i. 1, 9, 10:—"Know this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers (*andrapodistais*), for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine."

On the word *andrapodistais*, Bloomfield remarks:—"Expositors are agreed that the word means kidnapping free persons to be sold as slaves, a crime universally regarded as of the deepest dye, and always punished with

death."—Bloomfield's New Testament. And in the countries adjacent to that in which Timothy was when Paul wrote this epistle to him, we have express testimony that kidnapping prevailed.*

Says the distinguished Dr. Armstrong, in his work on "The Christian Doctrine of Slavery": "The distinctions between slaveholding and kidnapping is one always made, in so far as we know, in the laws of slaveholding states. Under Moses's law, *slaveholding* was expressly authorized, (Lev. xxv. 44-46,) whilst kidnapping was made a capital crime." "And he that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, (*i. e.*, 'though he had not actually sold him'—Bp. Patrick,) he shall thereby be put to death."—Ex. xxi. 16. See also Deut. xxiv. 7. Timothy, who "from a child had known the Holy Scriptures," the Old Testament Scriptures of course, for the New Testament was not written in Timothy's childhood, must have been familiar with this distinction; and when Paul writes to him, and, in giving a catalogue of sins to be condemned, mentions "man stealing" among crimes of the deepest dye, whilst in the same epistle he requires him to teach *slaves* to obey their *masters*; and this the more heartily when the masters are Christian men, and to withdraw himself from any who should teach a different

* "The Thessalonians, according to Aristophanes, were notorious for stealing persons of inglorious birth and education, and selling them as slaves. But if any person was convicted of having betrayed a freeman, he was severely punished by Solon's laws."—Potter's Gr, Ant. i. 10.

doctrine, (see 1 Tim. vi. 1--5,) the idea would be suggested inevitably that the distinction made in Moses's law continued under the Gospel dispensation."

Think of this, O ye Republicans, sinners and hypocrites!!!

Having showed that slavery was sanctioned by the Old Testament, we will proceed to show that it is also sanctioned by the New Testament, and will only quote a few passages as our limited space will not admit of an extensive quotation.

"And ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening, knowing that your master also is in heaven, neither is there respect of persons with him."

"Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a master in heaven."
—Paraphrase: Ye masters (who are saints and faithful brethren in Christ at Colosse, i. 2), give unto your slaves (douloi) that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a master in heaven.

"And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them a service, because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort."
"Servants (douloi) be obedient to those that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your hearts, as unto Christ; not with eyeservice, as man pleasers, but as the servants (douloi) of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good-

will doing service as to the Lord, and not to men: knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be *bond* or free." "And ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening; knowing that your master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him."—Eph. vi. 5-9.

It is a very singular fact that Helper quotes very little from the Bible to sustain (as he thinks) his declaration that the Bible is opposed to slavery. By reading what he has quoted, and what we have, there would seem to be a contradiction of the Bible. Not at all, for if we had the space, we could easily show not, but rather show that the Bible is a whole defense of slavery. We would recommend the reader to get a work entitled, "Bible Defense of Slavery," which obviates all further trouble on this point. Hence the saying of Mr. Burlingame, of Massachusetts, that "we must have an anti-slavery Bible, an anti-slavery Constitution, and an anti-slavery God."

CHAPTER XI.

Our Views on Slavery—The Negró as he is, incompetent to do for Himself—The Proofs—Conclusion.

SLAVERY, in most of its aspects, has occupied the attention and exhausted the eloquence of the lights of our political horizon. No question has ever been agitated more earnestly, or argued in a more acrimonious spirit. None offered better opportunities to the pseudo-philanthropical debaters,—none presented the same record of enmity and recrimination existing between antagonistic parties,—all other issues have sunk into insignificance beside it; and, the termination of the controversy, who can foresee?

Gentlemen from the North (representing the conservative element of the Abolition party) protest against the existence of a servile class amongst them as an infraction of the laws of God, and as opposed to the interests of society! They speak of gradual manumission—colonization—of the inalienable rights of men—of the laws of morality, and the principles of justice. Their confrères,—pleasantly oblivious to the records of the past, to the teachings of science, and to common sense,—and they hold the institution as a curse, condemn the slaveholder as a

monster, assert the equality—physical, moral, and intellectual—of the Caucasian and the Negro; and, like their gifted ally, that pious patriot, Mr. Burlingame, suggest (with the example of the French Assembly fresh in their memory) the substitution of a new Constitution, a new Bible, and a new God, for those which we at present recognize! This is an eloquent exordium, but apparently implies a *slight* distrust in the warrant which religion and law give them for their crusade against the South. However true the Roman moralist's remark may be, that "no man is wise at all times," it will scarcely cover the case of those who are not so at any time. Calm people, whose time is not taken up with preaching a war of extermination against those of our countrymen who live south of Mason and Dixon's line; must, we are inclined to believe, look upon the extremists of both parties with a feeling very much like contempt, for both, in the heat of personal feeling, appear to have entirely lost sight of the only arguments upon which the question can be rationally based:—

Is the negro equal to the white man?—the African to the Caucasian?

1st, Intellectually.—History, which is the record of the development of the human race in time and space, rather militates against such a conclusion. Optimism and philanthropy are both highly creditable to human nature, but neither the one nor the other can be considered to the exclusion of facts. It might be pertinently asked of those who avow their belief in the equality of the slave and his

master, how the negro came to be his slave, when both races were equally endowed by nature? and, *more Socratico*, he (the interrogator) might calmly inquire into the cause (which the Abolitionists would doubtless be able to assign) why it was that the negro was always a slave,—in India, Syria, and Egypt, three thousand years ago, as in Georgia, Louisiana, and Virginia, to-day, with the same brain in the same proportion to the white races?—why, in the revolutions that have convulsed the nations under whom he lived a servant, has he not thrown off his fetters and become free?—or, rather, when undisturbed in the possession of those regions in which he attains his greatest physical perfection, and into which no invading army has ever penetrated, has he not, from the elaboration of those elements which he has in common with the Caucasian, rivalled in some degree his progress in arms, arts, and letters?

Where are the obelisks of the Gold coast, the pyramids of Guinea, the temples of Zanguebar?—Gone! Where are their ruins? Why has no navigator of the early times mentioned their existence, or recorded their traditions, in the unknown lands which recent enterprise has presented to us?

In that delightful “province of the sun,” explored by the English, where, generation after generation, age after age, the negro has lived secure from foreign invasion, why have no monuments of intellectual equality, greeted the explorers, which would warrant us in believing in the doctrine? Not to elevate the standard too high,—has the

African ever equalled the Mongolian? Where, in the lands in which he has been domesticated, has he adopted the civilization around him, or preserved it, when removed for any length of time from those who taught it?

The elevated plateau of the Indo-Chinese world is scarcely more accessible, and has been little more open to foreign innovations than Africa. Can any similarity be traced between them?—any man in his senses compare one with the other? Yet the Mongol is not more superior to the negro than the Caucasian to him.

If it be answered to this, that the race is one condemned by heaven, and the authority of the Old Testament (which is not recognized as applicable by modern science) cited to explain the reasons for that state of degradation which has ever been the lot of the African; then it appears that these gentlemen, disregarding the remonstrances of St. Augustine, are using one part of the Bible to disprove the other; and (as we believe no new revelation has revoked the decree) trying to do, for the love of God, that which he has asserted should not be done. The inconvenience arising from this position of the question, no doubt, suggested to the inventive mind of the gentleman before quoted, the idea of having a new Bible.

But, perhaps, the Northern philanthropist to whom these arguments were supposed to be addressed, having been fortunate enough to be born in Boston, and therefore, by divine right, knowing rather more than other people, might have answered the questions, though he could not have

denied the facts. Is there nothing more to be said? Plenty. The only difficulty is how to say it without preventing those who are not initiated into the mysteries of science from clearly comprehending it; and, also, without shocking the pure in heart, by an apparent contradiction of the Mosaic records.

“Jefferson, in his notes, says slavery is an evil,” (vehemently assert the gentlemen from the North.) And Jefferson was a slaveholder, and a Virginian, too. Certainly, he was more than this: he was a patriot—the author of the Declaration of Independence. He was a scholar, and a philosopher in his way, also. But then Jefferson was, after all, a man, and “*humanum est errare*” was as true when he lived as at this day.

Unfortunately for his authority upon this point, most of that knowledge which can really render this question of slavery or abolition a rational one, was then unknown, or had, rather, no regular or scientific form. History, it is true, taught its lessons then as now; but Ethnology, in all its departments, Physiology, Comparative Anatomy, Iconology, Comparative Philology, etc. etc.,—how about these! Are they unworthy our attention! But does history pronounce decidedly and without appeal against the institution of slavery? If so,—where! In Egypt, in India,—in Greece,—Rome,—on the coasts of Africa, or the nations of the modern world? It would evidently be impossible to review their civilization in such a manner as to assert that it either did or did not. We can simply inquire

whether this evil, fatal to the advance of improvement, the development of intellect, and the existence of refinement, is so represented in the records transmitted to us of these States? It may be so, but I have never heard that any one of the holy Avatars was undertaken to destroy this hydra. It appears that, at the same period when the chisel of the artist sculptured the negro slave upon the marbles of the Thebais, the great Rameses was prosecuting his conquests. Thucydides and Polybius are strangely silent. Tacitus and Livy—why have they, who saw it in its worst and most cruel form, not depicted its tendencies and revealed its defects?

Yet slavery in the nations of antiquity, and also of the middle ages, was far more reprehensible than that of the United States: for it was the bondage of the white man to the white man—of equal to equal—as the event has in all these instances shown.

The conquered enemy, whatever might have been his country or condition, became, in most instances, the slave of his conqueror, who exercised over him absolute power. The revolutions of the East, the servile war of Lacedæmon and the insurrection of Spartacus, when compared with that of St. Domingo, show, certainly, the same spirit of rapine and cruelty; but, as to their results, there can be no mistake. The former ended in the final liberation of the oppressed class. Why? Did circumstances more favorable occur to them than to the negro? No; but the others possessed those elements which entitled them to supremacy,

and they won it,—more than this, they kept it: they were competent to bear the brunt of misfortunes, because nature has so ordered it, that no instance has ever yet occurred in the world's history, where a people have possessed the power of becoming free, civilized and enlightened, who have not compelled fate, as it were, to advance their interests.

To sum up: We know that, in the scale of humanity, the negro holds the lowest place; that no system of jurisprudence, no principle of science, no rule of art, has ever originated from the brain of an African.

That he has not the capacity for becoming, under any circumstances, an enlightened man; that the nearest approach to that state which he has made has not been permanent; and that, deprived of his teacher, he again degenerates into the condition of a barbarian.

To account for these conditions, some supposition is necessary. The first was, that the decree of Heaven had blasted the parent source of the race, and that the successors of the son of Noah had never been permitted to regain their former capacity, or to rival their brethren in the part which they enacted in the world's history.

If the hypothesis before stated be true to the extent to which some persons interpret it, the assertion of the "*equality*" of the races is neither more nor less than a contradiction of the manifest will, and an endeavor to change the evident intention of the Creator, and the at-

tempted demonstration by the Scriptures of the enormity of slaveholding becomes an absurdity.

It has been gravely asserted, however, that climate and the various phenomena of the external world have caused the change, now distinctive, between races. Without wishing to enter into a review of ethnological principles, let us merely suggest some of the peculiarities which mark the negro type, and if there are not physical reasons enough to satisfy the unprejudiced as to the very evident intention of Providence, we can scarcely hope to bring conviction by any less apparent method of proof. It is a fact well authenticated, that certain differences exist between the four great types of mankind, which have been permanent since the earliest period to which our knowledge extends. Whether the examination and analysis of these idiosyncracies are sufficient to prove that the Caucasian, American, Mongol, and Negro were aborigine, distinct and different races, is not our intention to inquire. All that we shall attempt is a demonstration of the physical inferiority of the African to the white man, and a brief review of the reasons which these afford us for placing this species of the "*genus homo*" in the rank which nature appears to have designed them to occupy.

The culminating point in the scale of created beings (physically considered) is man,—and of men, the Caucasian. The nearer the approach to this type, the greater the capacity has been, the more powerful the influence upon the history of humanity, and the more enlightened

the individual and nation. This type, moreover, presents besides the physical conformation most in accordance with the ideal in art, peculiarities of temperament and intellect which have, under all circumstances, urged them onward; they are the masters of the world,—the investigators, the inventors.

Between the first mentioned race (the Caucasian) and the Negro, two great types intervene, the Mongol and the American; the first, capable of civilization but not enlightenment; the second, in his pure and unmixed blood, incapable of either. The intention which would appear from the analogies of the natural world with regard to the condition under which its various species were to exist, nowhere is more strikingly exemplified than in the destiny which has attended the races first mentioned. It would seem as if there were some absolute and unchanging influence exerted upon each, which has ever circumscribed their progress and regulated their efforts. The field of universal history, infinitely diversified in its incidents, presents a singular uniformity in the events which have marked the rise, progress, and decay, of the various varieties into which naturalists have divided mankind. There has been no great variation in the consequence, even amid the infinite multiplicity of causes which have effected them.

Without asserting the identity of the spiritual and material, it is an indisputable fact that intellectual superiority generally depends upon and is coincident

with organic. Though the quality, rather than the quantity, of the brain, is considered the sign of mind, yet it is as impossible to suppose the power of an engine residing in its miniature patent, as the intelligence of the cranium whose facial angle is 85° existing in one of little more than half that capacity. The lower orders of animated nature, are ranked according to their approach to the anatomical structure of man. The same holds good in the classification of the races themselves. The negro is the furthest removed from the perfect type, and the nearest to the anthropoid simiæ of any.

Nature has, for three thousand years, made no change in this conformation, and as the law of hybridity applies as well to men as other animals, is not likely to do so now. The professions of friendship and brotherly kindness on the part of the Abolition party, can scarcely make a difference in the shape of the bones of the cranium and body. And while these do exist, if there can be any judgment of the future, formed from the events of the past, the African will still be a slave, if not to one master, at least to another.

Now, fellow-citizens, having presented to your view the "Irrepressible Conflict" that is going on between the enemies of the Constitution, as well as its friends, and the "Impending Crisis" as it is, we call upon you to come forward, lift your voices, your hands, and your hearts, in behalf of the Union, and preserve it from the almost inevitable fate that awaits it—destruction!

In pursuance of this, we call upon every conservative man in the North, who loves his country and her institutions, to shake off the trammels of the fanaticism of the North, and swear before God and upon the altar of his country, that he will stand by her Constitution and laws as they are, as enacted by Congress and interpreted by the Supreme Court. And to use the language of another: "Then we shall see every heart a shield, and a drawn sword in every hand to preserve the ark of our political safety! Then we shall see reared, a fabric upon our National Constitution, which time cannot crumble, persecution shake, fanaticism disturb, nor revolution change; but which shall stand among us like some lofty and stupendous Apennine, while the earth rocks at its feet, and the thunder peals above its head!"

Contemplating our country and its enemies (*Republicans*) may we not exclaim with the poet:

"Country, on thy sons depending,
Strong in manhood, bright in bloom,
Hast thou not seen thy pride descending,
Shrouded to the unbounded tomb?
Rise!—on eagle pinion soaring—
Rise like one of Godlike birth—
And, Jehovah's aid imploring,
Sweep the SPOILER from the earth."

THE END.